GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL SERIES

Class B, No. 8

GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL SERIES

Class B, No. 8

PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF
THE PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT OF
THE BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL
RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
POONA

POONA

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

1942

Government Oriental Series — Class B No. 8

PROGRESS OF INDIC STUDIES

1917 — 1942

EDITED BY

R. N. DANDEKAR, M. A., Ph. D.

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

SILVER JUBILEE

1942

POONA

Copies can be had direct from the
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona (4) India.

Price Rs. 8 per copy, exclusive of Postage

Printed at the Aryabhushan Press, 915/1 Shivajinagar, Poona 4, by Mr. V. H. Barve
and Published by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Hon. Secretary, Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona 4.

PREFACE

The last twenty-five years may adequately be regarded as the period of renaissance in the history of Indological Studies. A general resurgence of the spirit of nationalism became evident in India in the first decade of this century. It was not merely a political movement; indeed it proved to be a veritable source of inspiration for the revival of the whole cultural life of this country on national basis. Indians began to take special interest in the ancient history and culture of their mother-land. Work of first rate importance had been done—and was still being done—in that field by many a worthy savant of the West. But there gradually came a feeling upon Indian scholars that they could till the soil which they owned more fruitfully than foreigners. They therefore applied themselves to Indic Studies with renewed vigour and enthusiasm. This time they approached these subjects neither with the blind faith of orthodox Indians nor with the disparaging attitude exhibited by some Europeans, but in a scientific spirit which they had acquired and assimilated, to a considerable extent, through Western education. Their inspiration came from within while the methods, which they adopted, were generally borrowed from without.

The external results of this impetus could be clearly seen in the establishment of faculties of Oriental Studies in the Indian Universities, in the foundation of Institutions devoted to Oriental research, in the starting of journals for the same purpose and in many such academic movements. In 1919 the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute inaugurated the All India Oriental Conference, which, since then, has been regularly holding its sessions every two years and which has now definitely established itself as a common meeting ground for the workers in this branch of learning. The work done in the field of Indology during the last quarter of a century is thus the result of the labours of Indian as well as Western scholars.

The usefulness of a retrospect of the work, which has already been done in the field of Oriental research, to a student of the subject is quite patent. Apart from being a source of inspiration, it would show where we actually stand today and what we have still to achieve.

I considered the Silver Jubilee of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute as the most suitable occasion to undertake a survey of the progress made in Indic Studies, in India and outside, during the last twenty-five years. Accordingly I requested several scholars to co-operate with me and I take this opportunity of expressing my heart-felt gratitude to all of them for their willing response. Without their kind collaboration this work would have been impossible. According to the original plan Dr. S. M. H. Nainar of the University of Madras had kindly undertaken to make a resumé of Islamic Studies; but owing to some unforeseen circumstances he could not complete it. It was then too late to entrust the work to any other scholar. I therefore apologise to the readers for having to leave this 'Survey' incomplete to that extent.

My sincere thanks are due to Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, Dr. S. M. Katre and Mr. P. K. Gode who have helped me throughout the preparation of this volume. I have also to thank Mr. G. N. Shrigondekar of the Publication Department of the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute and the Manager of the Aryabhushan Press, who relieved me of much of the technical work in connection with this publication.

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona
4th January 1943.

R. N. DANDEKAR

CONTENTS

(1) Twenty-five Years of Vedic Studies

—R. N. DANDEKAR, M. A., Ph. D. ... 1—68

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

(2) A Survey of Work done, in India and outside during the last twenty-five years, in the field of Iranian Studies

—J. M. UNVALA, Ph. D. ... 69—99

Mariampura, Navasari.

(3) Twenty-five Years of Epic and Puranic Studies

—A. D. PUSALKER, M. A., LL. B., Ph. D. ... 101-152

Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.

(4) A brief Sketch of Prākrit Studies

—A. M. GHATAGE, M. A., Ph. D. ... 153-174

Rajaram College, Kolhapur.

(5) A brief Survey of the Work done in the field of Classical Sanskrit Literature during the last twenty-five Years

—LATE DR. HAR DUTT SHARMA, M.A., Ph.D. ... 175-194

Hindu College, Delhi.

(6) Pre-Vedic Times to Vijayanagara : A Survey of 25 Years' Work in Ancient Indian History and Archæology

—H. D. SANKALIA, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D. ... 195-238

Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute, Poona.

(7) Progress of South Indian Archæology and Epigraphy during the past 25 Years

—R. S. PANCHAMUKHI, M. A. ... 239-251

Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar.

(8) Progress of Greater Indian Research during the last twenty-five Years (1917-1942)
—U. N. GHOSHAL, M. A., Ph. D. ... 253-320
Greater India Society, Calcutta.

(9) Linguistics in India (1917-1942)
—SUNITI KUMAR CHATTERJI, M.A., D. Litt. ... 321-331
University of Calcutta, Calcutta.

(10) A Survey of Research in Indian Sociology in relation to Hindu *Dharma-Śāstras* (1917-1942)
—PANDHARINATH VALAVALKAR, LL.B., Ph.D. ... 333-374
Khalsa College, Bombay.

(11) Indian Philosophy: A Survey (1917-1942)
—P. T. RAJU, M. A., Ph. D. ... 375-398
Andhra University, Waltair.

(12) Study of Manuscripts
—CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI, M. A. ... 399-406
Krishnagar College, Nadia.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF VEDIC STUDIES

BY

R. N. DANDEKAR

Nearly a century and a half has elapsed since Colebrooke published his monograph "On the Vedas, or Sacred Writings of the Hindus" (*As. Res.* VIII, Calcutta, 1805) and thus inaugurated what may be called the modern period in the history of the Vedic studies. Though that scholar applied himself to the study of Sanskrit literature in quite a systematic manner, it seems that he was not able to make a proper estimate of the Veda. The credit of making a more or less critical and scientific approach to this branch of Sanskrit philology, for the first time, goes to Eugène Burnouf, who was essentially a pioneer and pathmaker, and his two German pupils, Roth and Max Müller. It was in the year 1845, when attending the lectures of Burnouf at Paris, that, for the time Max Müller's thoughts became fixed on an edition of the Ṛgveda (RV) and its voluminous commentary. The first volume of the Oxford edition of RV was consequently published in 1849 and the sixth and the last in 1874. The work of interpreting Veda, begun by Roth in the Petersburg lexicon, was continued by Max Müller, Weber, Bergaigne, Oldenberg, Hillebrandt, Pischel, Geldner and many others. Since then valuable contributions have been made, and continue to be made even to this day, to various branches of Vedic philology by Vedists in almost all countries where Sanskrit is studied. Several times during this long period of fruitful research, scholars have tried to take stock of the work already done in this field. As early as 1893 Ludwig considered and criticised in his book, "Über die neuesten Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete der RV-Forschung", the views of Max Müller and others in regard to the interpretation of Veda. But a proper attempt in this direction must be said to have been first made by Oldenberg in his "Vedaforschung" (1905). Starting with the assumption that the history of Vedic research was, to a considerable extent, the history of a serious controversy regarding the correctness or otherwise of the methods as well as the results of investigation, he has stated and subjected to a critical examination the theories about the interpretation of Veda put forth by Roth, Bergaigne, Pischel, Geldner and others. He also undertakes to evaluate the work already done in the field of Vedic grammar,

Vedic religion and philosophy, Vedic history and Vedic text-criticism. Between 1917 and 1920, Windisch published his excellent work, "Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde", wherein he has surveyed almost all the work done, up to his time, in the field not only of Vedic research but of Indian literature and culture as a whole. The original plan of Windisch however was to give an up-to-date history of Vedic studies. A work exclusively devoted to the history of Vedic philology, which may be compared with that of Oldenberg, is L. Renou's "Les Maîtres de la Philologie Védique" (Paris, 1928). Taking into account the chief contributions made by Vedic scholars from Colebrooke to Oldenberg, Renou has surveyed the main lines followed by Vedic research during the last 125 years. In a monograph entitled "Indisch" (*Ges. der idg. Spw.* II. 4, Berlin, 1929), W. Wüst traces the entire development of Indian linguistics and thus deals in a way with the linguistic aspect of Vedic studies. In 1931, Renou published his "Bibliographie Védique" (Paris). This work, which evinces colossal labour on the part of the compiler, contains about 6500 references grouped, in a very practical manner, in 201 sections resulting from the methodical analysis of the subject-matter, and thus forms an exhaustive index to all published Vedic texts and the entire body of exegetical and critical literature connected with those texts, directly or indirectly. It is accordingly the most complete record of all that has been done about Veda, in any country, up to 1931.[1] "L' Indo-Aryen, du Veda aux Temps modernes" (Paris, 1934) by Jules Bloch is an admirable resumé and review of the general lines of development of the Aryan speech in India from the time of the Veda to the present day. This book therefore serves as an excellent guide to the principal studies dealing with Vedic language. It is needless to dilate upon the importance and usefulness of such monographs, reviewing the progress made in Vedic philology as a whole or in any particular branch of it, from the point of view of further research in the subject. A fresh attempt will be made in this paper to survey briefly, in a more or less objective manner, the important work done in the field of Vedic studies, in India and outside, during the last twenty-five years.

This quarter of a century has proved to be a period of remarkable activity in Oriental research in this country. The All India Oriental Conference (A I O C), the first session of which was

1 The present writer has prepared and proposes to publish a bibliography of Vedic studies after 1931.

organised by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, more than 20 years ago, has been giving, from year to year, new impetus to Oriental scholars throughout this country and has been aiming at co-ordinating their work. The Vedic section, which has been instrumental in promoting an all-sided Vedic research, is one of the principal sections of that conference. This period has also seen the inauguration of new research institutes and the rejuvination of old ones. An independent status is gradually being conceded in the universities to the faculty of Vedic studies and many academic bodies are devoting themselves exclusively or prominently to research in Vedic philology. The importance of the science of linguistics has now been fully recognised and the encouragement generally given to its study has helped also to promote the study of the Veda. Consequently veritable centres of Vedic research have developed in different parts of India. A considerable amount of valuable work continues to be produced, in this field, even to this day, in Europe and America also. It is true that many times there comes the feeling that the golden age of Vedic research, in the West, has faded into the past. The giants of those days, like Oldenberg and Hillebrandt, Pischel and Geldner, Whitney and Bloomfield, Macdonell and Caland, have departed, some of them only recently. But the magnificent tradition of Vedic scholarship set up by them is fortunately not completely extinct. Contributions of first rate importance are still being made by Western scholars to this branch of Indology. A survey of the progress so made by Vedists, in India and outside, will clearly indicate the present state of our knowledge about Veda and will also bring out prominently such problems as still need serious consideration by scholars.

Vedic texts : Saṁhitās : A very notable feature of Vedic studies during the last 25 years is the publication of new editions of a large number of Vedic texts. It is now fully realised that the fundamental need of scientific investigation, in this field, is the critical and reliable editions of the texts. Many Vedic texts have therefore been reedited according to the accepted principles of textual criticism, which has now properly developed into a regular science. The Oxford edition of the RV giving the text in saṁhitā and padapāṭha, together with the bhāṣya of Sāyaṇa, prepared by Max Müller, and published between 1849 and 1874, undoubtedly marks quite a new epoch in the history of the study of Vedic texts. This monumental work was rightly made the basis of all research concerning RV for a long time. But that *editio princeps* has now long been out of

print. Moreover the discovery of new Mss has necessitated some improvement in the text of the Sāyaṇabhāṣya. The Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala of Poona have based their text of the Sāyaṇabhāṣya, which they are publishing in their excellent edition of Ṛk-saṁhitā with padapāṭha, on the collation of a large number of new Mss in different scripts. They have also taken into account various other texts and commentaries published since the time of Max Müller, and this fact has enabled them to settle the text of the bhāṣya in a more adequate and convincing manner. Three volumes of this edition of RV, comprising the first eight maṇḍalas, have been published by the Maṇḍala, between 1933 and 1941. The editor has critically discussed in his introduction the improvements which this edition has made over the earlier ones. The entire published portion evinces, on the whole, expert editing, and may be safely relied upon as the basis for further research. A similar enterprise has been undertaken by the Indian Research Institute of Calcutta, but their whole scheme is very ambitious. Their edition is normally divided into three sections; in the first section the text of each Ṛk of the saṁhitā is given together with the padapāṭha and the commentary of Sāyaṇa. To this are further added notes on the sense of the mantras, drawn from the commentaries of Skandasvāmin and Veṅkaṭamādhava. In the second section each RV-hymn is preceded by an introductory note in English, which mainly deals with its viniyoga and other relevant matter; then the text of a stanza is again given in romanised form; then come notes in English, mainly based on the commentary of Sāyaṇa; this is followed by much elaborate material of technical and exegetical character; and in the end one finds the new translation in English. The third section of this edition contains a Hindi summary of the English section. In the second and the following parts, English and Hindi translations of the Sāyaṇabhāṣya are also added. An attempt seems to have been made here to bring out more or less a variorum edition of RV. As a matter of fact this project is more important from the point of view of Vedic exegesis than that of textual criticism. One however feels that in many cases comment is too elaborate—in 22 big-sized pages of the first part (1933) only two Ṛks are discussed—and that the results so attained are not always commensurate with the labours expended. All the same when this enormous edition is completed—very little progress has been made so far—it will have brought together, in one place, all the important exegetical literature relating to RV. A Ṛk-saṁhitā is published in the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, in 1929, but its main feature

lies not in the text of the saṁhitā itself, but in the bhāṣya of Skandasvāmin and the dīpikā of Veṅkaṭamādhavārya. The same may be said with reference to the edition of RV prepared by L. Sarup, which is to be published in six volumes and which gives the commentary, Ṛgarthadīpikā of Veṅkaṭamādhava, with comparative notes.

Some excellent critical editions of the Sāmaveda-saṁhitā (SV) were also published during the period under review. As early as 1921, the text of SV edited with commentary by Ray was given out in Bombay. But the SV published in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series, in 1936, is much more scientifically planned by its editor, Bhavavibhuti Bhattacharya. Each sāman is given with its padapāṭha and is followed by a carefully corrected text of the Sāyaṇabhāṣya. A Sanskrit summary of the bhāṣya is also added. The editor has supplied variant readings, references to corresponding RV-verses, English translation, and copious notes dealing with grammar, mythology, exegesis and philology. Dr. Raghu Vira of Lahore has issued (1938) the SV-saṁhitā of the Jaiminīyas, together with its mantra-index. Dr. Raja has edited the SV (Adyar 1941) with the commentaries of Mādhava and Bharatasvāmin, which were so far but little known. Carefully edited texts of SV have thus been made available in recent years and these can now very well form the basis of further investigation.

Among the texts of black Yajurveda (YV), mention must first be made of Schröder's new edition of the Maitrāyaṇī saṁhitā (Leipzig, 1923). That scholar had already published also the Kaṭha-saṁhitā. In 1932, the *editio princeps* of the Kapiṣṭhala-saṁhitā appeared at Lahore. It was critically prepared by Raghu Vira from only one manuscript. The text of the saṁhitā is carefully reconstructed and compared with that of the Kaṭha-saṁhitā. The editor's scholarly introduction deals with several topics such as the peculiarities of the Kapiṣṭhala Ms regarding saṁdhi, accentuation etc., division of the text and a concordance of the sections of the Kap. and Kāṭh. saṁhitās. But by far the most instructive part of it is that where the editor gives a list of corrections and emendations in Schröder's Kāṭh text, as suggested by Kap. readings. Ever since the publication of Raghu Vira's edition of Kap.-saṁhitā, H. Oertel has been using the new material for many useful papers, sometimes supplementing Raghu Vira's work and at other times correcting and adding to Bloomfield's "Vedic Variants". All these papers are now made available in the form of a book, "Zur Kap. Kāṭh. saṁhitā" (München, 1934). The first part of this work deals with RV-citations in

Kap. and Kāṭh. saṁhitās. They are classified under four sections on the basis of mutual agreement or otherwise among RV, Kap. and Kāṭh. saṁhitās. The second part examines critically the emendations in the Kap. text suggested by various scholars, and is supplemented by Oertel's own suggestions. The remaining parts are more or less of a linguistic character, though they indirectly throw some light on the text of the saṁhitā. Only three editions of the white YV-saṁhitā may be mentioned here—one published by the Nirnayasagar Press (Bombay, 1929) and the other two, which contain also the Marathi translations, prepared by Bapat Shastri (Aundh, 1941) and Pathak Shastri (Poona, 1941). In " Die Yajus des Aśvamedha " (Bonn, 1939), Dr. Bhawe has reconstituted the mantras, referring to Aśvamedha, from the traditional texts of the five different schools of the YV. He has also made a comparative study of those texts from the point of view of topics such as the position of Aśvamedha, its rituals, the order of mantras etc.

It is indeed a happy sign that valuable work has been done, in recent years, with regard to the texts of the Atharvaveda (AV). Though the original edition of AV was carefully prepared by Roth and Whitney, it still needed revision. This work of revising the text was undertaken by a competent scholar, Lindenau, and the revised edition was brought out in 1924 at Berlin. The importance of the Kashmirian recension of AV was long ago recognised by Roth, Garbe, Bloomfield and others, who thought that valuable results might be obtained by comparing that recension with other texts. It was in 1901 that the fascimile of the Ms of the Kash. AV was published by the John Hopkins University. One of Bloomfield's students of that time, L. C. Barret, edited critically, in 1905, the first book by way of a doctorate thesis. Since then Barret worked on the edition of the whole Kash. text, with single-minded devotion, and after creditable labour of more than 30 years, the last volume was given out in 1940. Generally speaking the reconstruction of a text from one single incorrect Ms is not viewed with approval by scholars. But the Paippalāda recension (P) of the AV differs so much from the Śaunaka (Ś) recension, which is more familiar, that it was considered essential to publish the former, based on only one Ms as it is. Barret's edition gives the italicized transliterated text of each hymn, references to folio and line number of the fascicule of the Ms, the pada text in romanised form, and varied notes on the difficulties of the text. Dr. Raghu Vira has published the Devanāgarī edition of the P.-saṁhitā, between 1936 and 1941. On each

big-sized page there are three columns; the first gives notes regarding variants and corresponding passages in other texts; the second presents the revised text of the saṁhitā together with the numbers of mantra, kāṇḍa and anuvāka, whereever possible; and in the third column the readings are discussed. Two appendices are added, one giving conspectus of Ś and P, which is very useful, and the other containing P verse-index. A study of these two editions of the P recension is bound to help our understanding of the difficult AV-text-tradition, to a considerable extent. The RV has been so long the main basis of Vedic research, and that very deservedly. Now that excellent editions of AV also are made available, it is hoped that that Veda, which is equally important, will be subjected to more critical study than heretofore.

In addition to the editions of the Vedic saṁhitās mentioned above, two cheap and handy editions of all the four saṁhitās appeared during this period: one published by the Vedic Yantrālaya of Ajmer (1925-28) and the other published by Pandit Satavalekar (Aundh, 1937-39). The latter edition deserves special mention on account of the editor's scrupulousness in presenting the most accurate text and his anxiety to offer the same at cheap price. Pandit Satavalekar has supplied a short but very informative introduction for each saṁhitā. In the preparation of the AV-saṁhitā, the P recension has been duly taken into consideration and an appendix giving important variant readings has been added. In the SV-saṁhitā, besides surveying the whole SV-literature, the editor has discussed, by way of an introduction, such phenomena as *vikāra*, *viśleṣaṇa*, *abhyāsa* and *stobha*, and has also explained the SV-system of accentuation. In short the Aundh edition of SV is certainly more exhaustive than that of Benfey. By offering such very accurate texts of Vedic saṁhitās, at cost price, Panditji has done a great service to the cause of Vedic studies.

Brāhmaṇas: Turning from the recent editions of the saṁhitā texts to those of the Brāhmaṇa texts (Br.), one first of all notices, with the greatest admiration, Caland's monumental edition of the Śatapatha Br. (SB), in the Kāṇvīya (K) recension (Lahore, 1926). The edition of SB first published by Weber in 1849 and reprinted in 1924, as well as the Calcutta edition (1900) and the Ajmer edition (1902), give the text according to the Mādhyaṁdina (M) recension. Eggeling also follows the M text for his translation. Eggeling had handed over all the material collected by him for the reconstitution of the K recension to Caland, and it redounds to the credit of the

expert scholarship of the latter that he has made the best use of it in his edition of K text of SB. The text is here given in Devanāgarī character and an elaborate historical and critical introduction has been added. Books 1 to 7 of K text, which correspond with books 1 to 5 of M, have been critically edited, while, in view of the fact that K books 8 to 16 generally agree with M books 6 to 14, only a list of distinctive readings from the K text has been given. The K text does not differ from the M text so much in respect of the matter as in respect of the arrangement of parts and the traditions. Caland's masterly introduction, which comprises five chapters, deals with many important topics such as the place of SB in Vedic literature, its two recensions, the system of accentuation, which is by itself an exceedingly original and much-needed contribution, the Mss of K recension, the grammatical and linguistic peculiarities of the K text and the relationship between K and M and between SB and other YV and non-YV literature. With regard to the mutual relationship between K and M, Caland concludes that from the beginning there existed two independent recensions of a Vājasaneyī Br., comprising the materials of K books 1 to 7 and M books 1 to 5, closely related to each other, one of which, K, has been influenced in some way by the other. This edition has amply proved that Caland was the most competent scholar to work on Br.-exegesis. A new edition of SB in the M recension, which has been published recently in 5 parts (Kalyan, 1940-41), gives the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Hari-svāmin. It also contains an introduction in Sanskrit, which, in addition to the usual topics, supplies some information about the several commentators of SB.

Another Br., which has been critically worked out by Caland, is the Tāṇḍya-mahā-brāhmaṇa (TMB), also called the Prauḍha Br. or Pañcaviṁśa Br. (PB). The text of this Br. was first edited, together with the Sāyaṇabhāṣya, in the Bibliotheca Indica (Calcutta) between 1870 and 1874. Caland's very accurate translation of this Br. (Bibl. Ind., Calcutta, 1931) helps one to solve a large number of difficulties presented by the text. Caland has also given copious explanatory notes, references and concordances. In a short but highly informative introduction, he deals with some significant problems of the relative chronology of the SV-texts. He accepts the priority of the pūrvārcikā to the uttarārcikā, which was suggested by Oldenberg. According to Caland the uttarārcikā did not exist in the time of the author of TMB, but the chanters drew the verses, which they wanted, directly from the RV-saṁhitā. The uttarārcikā was composed in later times so that there might be available, in the order of the

sacrifices, the verses required to be sung. Caland further attempts to prove that TMB is later than the Maitrāyaṇī and Kāṭh. saṁhitās and the Jaiminīya Br. (JB). The text of the Pañcaviṁśa Br. offered by the Bibl. Ind. edition has been greatly improved upon in the edition prepared by Chinnasvami Shastri (Benares, 1938). His text is based, in addition to the Calcutta edition, on two Mss in Grantha character and three in the Nāgarī, which fact makes it more reliable. The editor has traced the quotations in the text and the Sāyaṇabhāsya to their original sources. A scholarly introduction discussing the text and its relationship with the Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana and Āpastamba, as well as a number of indexes, have greatly enhanced the usefulness of the work. A project for editing the JB was undertaken, nearly 50 years ago, first by Oertel and then by Caland. It was however not carried to completion, since adequate Ms-material was then not available. Only a few important pieces from that Br. were published by Oertel, in different journals, and Caland had suggested emendations in certain cases. In his Dutch monograph, "Over en uit het JB" (Amsterdam, 1914), Caland had further discussed in detail the relationship of the JB with the other Br. texts and had also given the Dutch translation of some passages. Some of his conclusions are that the Śāṭyāyani Br., which is known only through quotations, is very closely related to the JB, though not quite identical with it; that the JB stands very close to SB, and is earlier than its K recension but later than the M recension. In 1919, Caland published (Amsterdam) a selection of passages from the JB with their translation in German and a number of useful indexes. In many cases the text is hopelessly corrupt and the editor had to take recourse to conjectures. Among the passages selected by him are the legend of Yavakrī, the mahāvrata ritual, and the legend of Cyavana's rejuvination. Dr. Raghu Vira has now brought out a critically edited text of the first book of the JB (Lahore, 1937). In reconstructing the text he has utilised, in addition to the earlier printed portions, a large number of MSS from South India.

The text of the Gopatha Br. belonging to AV was edited (Leiden, 1919) by Gaastra with an introduction regarding the MSS etc., and explanatory notes and index. A study of this Br. will greatly help us to reconstruct the chronology of Vedic texts in general. Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh has made a valuable contribution to the text-critical study of the Brāhmaṇas, through his book, " Collection of the Fragments of lost Brāhmaṇas" (Calcutta, 1935), wherein he has brought together a large number of Br. quotations from ancil-

lary Vedic literature as well as from later Vedic literature. His comments on many points of linguistic usage will be found highly useful by a student of Vedic language. A reference may further be made, in this context, to Keith's translation of the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Br. of RV (HOS, 1920) and to the texts of Taittirīya Br. (Mysore, 1921), the Jaiminīya-upaniṣad Br. (Lahore, 1921) and the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka (Poona, 1922).

Upaniṣads: Coming to the Upaniṣad-texts (Up.), we find that most of the editions published during this period are rather of philosophical and exegetical than of text-critical significance. Great service has however been done to the study of the Up. by those scholars who have published, for the first time, texts which were hitherto either entirely unknown or but little known. As early as 1908, Prof. Schrader had announced the discovery, in the Adyar library, of the MSS of four unpublished but important Up. texts. He himself published one of the Up., the Bāṣkalamantra Up., which he considered to be the precursor of all Up. literature, as an appendix to one of the descriptive catalogues of MSS in the Adyar library. That one and the remaining three, Chāgaleya, Ārṣeya, and Śaunaka, are tentatively edited and translated by Dr. Belvalkar (Poona, 1925). The Bāṣkalamantra Up. contains, in an amplified form, the story of Indra and Medhātithi, which was foreshown in RV VIII. 2·40. In quite a henotheistic manner, Indra is there ultimately identified with the highest One. The Chāgaleya Up. discusses the relationship between body and soul on the basis of the *ratha-dṛṣṭānta.* A conversation among several sages regarding the most correct definition of *brahman* forms the principal topic of the Ārṣeya Up., which finally favours the definition proposed by Vasiṣṭha, namely, that *brahman* is identical with *ātman.* The Śaunaka Up. recommends the *upāsanā* of *praṇava.* The Adyar library has to its credit the publication of a series of several other unpublished Up. texts. In the first volume (Adyar, 1935–36), the ten Up. have been included with the commentary of Śrī Upaniṣad-Brahmayogin. This commentator belongs to the Śaṁkara school of advaita vedānta and he has succeeded, to a considerable extent, in clearly summarising the detailed explanations of Śaṁkarācārya. Moreover several passages, which were not explained by Śaṁkara, are commented upon by Brahmayogin. In the following two volumes (Adyar, 1938–40) a large number of minor Up. texts — the so-called sāmānya-vedānta-upaniṣads — are issued with an introductory note for each and English translation closely following

the commentary of Brahmayogin. This work of the Adyar library undoubtedly forms a valuable contribution to the study of the ancient Indian philosophical literature. The tāntric texts like Advaitabhāva Up., Kaulopaniṣad, Taropaniṣad etc. have also been made available recently (London, 1922) with an introduction by Avalon. Such other minor texts as the Amṛtabindu and the Kaivalya are edited (Madras, 1925) with commentary and English translation by A. Mahadeva Shastri. J. Scheftelowitz has published the Śivasaṁkalpa Up. in the *ZDMG* (Leipzig, 1921). Among useful collections of familiar Up. texts, mention may be made of Daśopaniṣadaḥ (Poona, 1937); the Up. series being published by Ramkrishna Math (Madras); Roer's edition of twelve principal Up. (Madras, 1931-32), which gives the text in Devanāgarī, the commentary of Śaṁkara, the gloss of Ānandagiri and translation and notes in English; the Upaniṣatsaṁgraha being serially issued by the Advaita Āśrama of Almora; and several AV-Up.-texts published, from time to time, in the *QJMS* (Bengalore).

Vedic Sūtras: In recent years considerable activity as regards the publication of the critical editions of the Vedic Sūtras — Srauta (SS), Gṛhya (GS), Dharma (DS), and Śulva (ŚuS)— has been evident in several centres in this country like Poona, Mysore, Baroda, Benares and Lahore. Dr. Bühler's edition of the Āpastamba DS, which offers the text with variant readings from the Hiraṇyakeśi DS, an alphabetical index of sūtras, a word-index and extracts from Haradatta's commentary, Ujjvalā, is recently issued in a revised form (Poona, 1932). The text of the Āp. ŚuS was published with the commentary of Kapardisvāmin, Karavinda and Sundararāja at Mysore, in 1931, and it throws great light on the mathematical technicalities of the Vedic sacrifice. A similar text belonging to the Kātyāyana school is edited with the commentary of Karka and the gloss of Mahīdhara in the Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series (Benares, 1936). A study of the text of the Mānava GS published (Baroda, 1926) with the commentary of Aṣṭāvakra, an introduction in Sanskrit and several indexes will considerably help one in properly evaluating Bühler's contention about the relationship between the Manusmṛti and a hypothetical Mānava DS. It may be noted in this connection that Prof. Knauer had published the first five books of Mānava ŚS (Petrograd) as early as 1900-03. The *cayana*, or ritual for the construction of the chief altar, belongs to this SS and forms the fifth vibhāga of that corpus, either by itself, according

to some Mss, or in combination with the *vājapeya* and *prāyaścitta*, according to others. Miss Van Gelder, a pupil of that most versatile Vedic scholar, Caland, has edited the section dealing with *cayana* (Leiden, 1921) and her excellent edition has proved to be of great value to a student of comparative religion and early Sanskrit. Fragments of the little known Baijavāpa GS are published for the first time (Lahore, 1926) by Bhagavaddatta. The caraṇavyūha of Śaunaka enumerates Baijavāpa as one of the fifteen divisions of Śukla YV. The GS-portion from Baijavāpa is extensively quoted in many works and Bhagavaddatta has tried to reconstruct, from these quotations, a tentative GS-text. A similar type of textual reconstruction has been attempted by Kane (*ABORI*, 1925–26) with reference to the DS of Śaṅkha-Likhita, which must have been obviously a very ancient work. Kane has also supplied a very useful introduction dealing with the important problems connected with this text.

But by far the most outstanding work in this branch has been done by Caland, who may be adequately called a great master of sūtra-reconstruction and sūtra-exegesis. He and his pupils have among themselves critically edited the largest number of sūtra-texts. A beginning in this direction was already made by Caland through the publication of the collection of the Pitṛmedha-sūtras drawn from the Baudh., Hiraṇya., and Gaut. schools and of the text of the Baudh. ŚS issued (Calcutta) in three books, with an index of proper names and a useful bibliography. His very illuminating German translation of the first seven books of the ŚS of Āp. (Göttingen, 1921) has clearly shown that Caland was the most competent scholar to tackle successfully the numerous intricacies of the Vedic ritualism. The ŚS, which are the manuals of Vedic sacrifice, are, according to Caland, only excerpts from the Br. texts. His expert knowledge of the Br. literature has consequently made his translation and notes particularly lucid. The text of the Jaiminīya GS of SV edited by him with extracts from the commentary of Śrīnivāsa as well as English notes, translation and introduction (Lahore, 1922) and the four instalments of his " Über das Vādhūla-sūtra " (*Acta Orient.*, 1922) amply testify to the scientific manner in which the excellent work already started was carried on by that scholar. The text of the Kāṭh. GS, which is traditionally associated with the name of Laugākṣi and the Cārāyaṇīya school, was reconstituted by Caland from the commentaries of Devapāla and Ādityadarśana, Brāhmaṇabala's Gṛhyapaddhati and a number

of *ṛcakas* and was published at Lahore (1925). The full corpus of the Vaikhānasa sūtras consists of a gṛhya section (praśnas 1 to 7), a dharma section (praśnas 8 to 10) and a pravarasūtra, which is a list of proper names agreeing closely with that of the Āp. Not finding adequate Mss-material for the reconstruction of an authoritative text, Eggers has given only the translation of the dharma section (Göttingen, 1929). But his text-critical and exegetical notes are highly suggestive. In his introduction to the translation Eggers deals with the conception of Vānaprasthāśrama in general and the several Vaikhānasa sects. For his critical edition of the Vaikh. GS (Calcutta, 1927-29), however, Caland has used Mss in Telugu and Grantha. In that work as well as in his monograph, "Over het Vaikh. Sūtra", that scholar discusses several details about the Vaikh. sūtra. In view of the incorrect Sanskrit idiom of this last of the sūtras belonging to the Taittirīya śākhā, Caland concludes that it was composed by a Brāhmaṇa whose Sanskrit was contaminated by Tamil. The author was presumably a Malyali and belonged to the 4th century A. D. In Manusmṛti (VI. 21) there is a reference to Vaikhānasa-mata. Caland finds a passage corresponding to it in the Vaikh. sūtra (IX. 5) and asserts that the author of the Manusmṛti must have known the text of the Vaikh. sūtra. Another interesting suggestion has been made by him. The mantras cited by pratīka in this sūtra are not to be found in the TS or the TB. Caland therefore assumes the existence of a Vaikh. saṁhitā whose relation to the sūtra is of precisely the same kind as the relation between the Āp.-mantrapāṭha and the Āp. GS. It should be noted that in 1930, for the first time, an edition of the text of the Vaikh. DS and the Pravarakhaṇḍa, together with English translation, is published at Madras. The second instalment of Caland's masterly German translation of the Āp. ŚS was given out at Amsterdam in 1928. With the exception of the Vitāna sūtras, which are texts of secondary importance, the ŚS of Āp. is the first SS to be translated. This second part is very important in so far as it deals with topics like the construction of the great altar, the Vājapeya, Rājasūya, Aśvamedha and Puruṣamedha sacrifices, and the rites of burial. The pithy notes supplied by the editor and the index make this translation a monument of fruitful scholarship. As usual Oertel has produced very valuable work based on Caland's translation of the Āp. ŚS. In his paper, "Zu Caland's Übersetzung des Āp. ŚS" (*ZII*, 1931), Oertel has discussed the citations from the saṁhitās and brāhmaṇas and has added important notes of

grammatical and lexicographical character. An estimate of Caland's work in regard to sūtra-texts will not be complete without a reference to the series of articles, " Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen sūtras ", contributed by him to *ZDMG* (Vol. 51 onwards). In those articles he treats, in his usual thorough manner, subjects like the Ārṣavivāha, the divinities of the morning and the evening offerings, the palāśa leaf in ritual, the wheel in ritual, eating in dreams etc. A very laudable feature of Caland's scholarly career is the tradition of pupils which he has created. A reference has already been made to the work of one of his pupils, Miss Gelder. His enthusiasm and critical method are to be seen also in the work of his other pupil, Dr. Raghu Vira. Dr. Raghu Vira has, by himself, edited critically the Bhāradvāja ŚS and the Vārāha GS together with short extracts from the paddhatis of Gaṅgādhara and Vasiṣṭha, and has prepared, in collaboration with his Guru, the *editio princeps* of the Vārāha ŚS (Lahore).

During the last couple of years the Āś GS has been subjected to a thorough and exhaustive study by Dr. Apte. In a paper contributed to *ABORI* (XX), he has given a detailed account of the contents of two rare Mss of the unpublished Āś-mantrasaṁhitā, which gives the mantras from RV, cited by pratīkas, in the ŚS and GS of Āś., in the order in which they occur in the present RV-saṁhitā. Some RV-mantras, cited in Āś GS, are however not to be found in that mantrasaṁhitā. In a text-critical examination of the sūtra (*BDCRI*, 1940), Apte has discussed the several possibilities as to why they have not been included therein. He has further attempted a much-needed research into the sources and interpretation of all non-RV-mantras and liturgical formulas employed in the GS of Aś (*NIA*, III). A study of the sūtras from this point of view, which has been, more or less, neglected so long, is bound to prove very useful for an understanding of the way in which several Vedic schools have originated and developed. Some eminent orientalists like Winternitz believe that, so far as the meanings of the mantras are concerned, their ritualistic application given in the ŚS and GS seems to be almost arbitrary. They would seem to have no rational connection with the particular rites in which they are employed. In a paper entitled " RV-mantras in their ritual setting in the GS" (*BDCRI* 1940), Apte strongly opposes this view and demonstrates, on the basis of a critical study of the RV-mantras cited in Aś GS, that these mantras can be clearly classified according as they have sacramental, invocational, mythological, oblational, or superficial

and traditional applicability in the gṛhya rites. It may be pointed out, in this context, that the Mīmāṁsā-grantha-prakāśaka-samiti of Poona has planned a series called "Kṛṣṇayajurveda-prakaraṇa-kaumudī", in which all the mantras of the YV will be arranged under appropriate ritualistic topics. The first volume of the series (Poona, 1938), containing the *ādhāna* and *punarādhāna* sections, indicates how this scheme will help the student in the understanding of the form and details of different sacrifices. On the whole, it will be seen that an all-sided study of the Vedic sūtras has been a distinctive feature of Vedic philology during the last twenty-five years.

Nirukta: Investigations into the several problems of the Nirukta (N) have been enthusiastically carried on ever since the days of the early Vedists, who had recognised the importance of the work from the point of view of Vedic exegesis and grammar, and of the history of ancient Indian philological speculations. Roth published for the first time a critical edition of N with introduction and very valuable notes in German, at Göttingen, in 1852. He had however not included therein any commentary. Since then several editions of the work have seen the light of the day. Satyavrata Sāmaśramī's edition, issued in four volumes (Bibl. Ind., 1852–1891), contains the commentary of Durga (D) and Devarājayajvan (De.). Besides the text and the commentaries, Sāmaśramī has brought out a monograph entitled "Niruktālocana", in which he treats various problems concerning the date, contents, authorship and commentaries of N. The text of D's commentary has been much improved upon in the Venkateshvar Press edition (1912–13) prepared by Śivadatta. It does not however contain the text of the Nighaṇṭu (Ni) and the commentary of De. Śivadatta has followed, for the first time, the practice of dividing the text into paragraphs and punctuating it. The Bombay Sanskrit Series has brought out the N with D's commentary in two volumes (Poona, 1918 and 1942). The first part of Rajvade's edition of N, which contains introduction, full texts of Ni and N, cursory examination of Ni, notes on the first three chapters of N and 25 indexes, was issued by the B. O. R. I., in 1940, on the occasion of that veteran scholar's eightieth birth-day. Rajvade must be said to have struck quite a new path in the field of Vedic exegesis, and though his interpretations are not always acceptable, they do make one think seriously. Two works, which deserve special mention in this section, are those by L. Sarup and H. Sköld. Sarup's excellent

edition of N (1920–29), embodied in six decent volumes, is the fruit of steady and scientific researches in the subject carried on by that scholar for several years. He has adopted the text of the shorter recension instead of that of the longer one, adopted by Roth. Indeed he produces evidence to show that Yāska's (Y) original work is represented by the shorter recension, which seems also to have been followed by D. According to him, the external evidence in the form of Mss and commentaries, enables one to trace the history of the text of N up to the time of D, that is to say, up to 1st century A. D. This does not however mean that the text of N, as represented by D's commentary, is identical with the archetype. In a recent paper, "The problem of Text–criticism of N" (Thomas Comm. Vol., Bombay, 1939), Sarup has made an attempt to detect the interpolations inserted in the text of N before the time of D. In his edition, besides the English translation, introduction, exegetical and critical notes, Sarup has issued an independent volume of fragments of the commentaries of Skandasvāmin (Sk) and Maheśvara (M). The puzzle of these two commentators is solved by him through a plausible suggestion that Sk's commentary is a bhāṣya on the N while M's notes are a ṭīkā on the bhāṣya of Sk. In the last volume comprising the indices and appendices to the N, Sarup has included an elaborate introduction embodying the results of his studies on the dates and relationship of various commentators belonging to the etymological school. Sk's date, according to him, is earlier than the first half of the 12th century A. D., though Dr. C. K. Raja assigns him to 600 A. D. As regards the Kautsa–problem, Sarup's conclusion is interesting. It is not because the heterodox views were very compelling in Y's times that they are represented in the N. It is merely a matter of more or less formal controversy, which requires a pūrvapakṣa.

H. Sköld's original plan was to prepare a vocabulary of the etymologies of N. But his studies in this line proved very fruitful from several points of view; and the results are presented in a neat volume, "The Nirukta: its place in old Indian Literature: its Etymologies" (Lund, 1926). The first part of the work is given to discussions concerning the relation of N to the Vedic literature and to some later works, which have ultimately led him to the following five important conclusions. (1) The influence of RV in N is preponderant. (2) The Ni was originally a list of RV–words. (3) The old Yajus–influence, of which there are strong traces in the N might have emanated from Y and his successors. (4) No parti-

cular Yajus-school can claim to have influenced the oldest form of the N. (5) No influence whatever from either SV or AV can be traced in the original N-nigamas. Sköld is in favour of the Indian tradition, which attributes the authorship of N to Y and maintains that though there seem to be some parts of the N, which did not originally exist within the frame of a common work, this book even in its present interpolated condition betrays the influence of a unifying hand, which must have been Y's. Sköld's list of etymologies, which forms the second part of his work, is most exhaustive and is a monument of scientific work. It will prove highly helpful for the linguistic, textual and exegetical study of the Veda.

Several minor problems originating from the study of N have been tackled by scholars during recent years. Dr. Gune has discussed the Br.-quotations in the N (RGB Comm. Vol., 1917). In his monograph, "Vedische Volksetymologie und das N." (*Archiv Orient.*, 1935), P. Poucha maintains that the N is, to a considerable extent, dependent on the traditional folk-etymologies to be found in the earlier Vedic texts and supports his view by furnishing Vedic basis for fifty etymologies given by Y in the N. His investigations are supplemented by R. R. Kashyap through his papers on "A Vedic Basis for the Etymologies in the N by Y" (*IC*, 1935-36).

Prātiśākhyas and other Vedāṅgas : The Prātiśākhyas (Pr.) have rightly been given an important place among the Vedāṅgas (Vg.) and it is encouraging to find that some very laudable work has been done in connection with the proper study of these ancient manuals of Vedic phonetics. A part of the introduction to the RV-Pr., which is critically edited with the commentary of Uvvaṭa by Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri, was issued in 1922, by the Oxford University Press. Since then the complete edition, with critical and additional notes, English translation of the text and several appendices and indices, has been published. The text of the Taitt. Pr. is critically edited, by Pandit Venkatarama Sharma (Madras, 1930), together with the bhāṣya of Māhiṣeya and a number of appendices. The commentary, which is based on one Ms only, seems to be written in a lucid style and is mostly free from abstruse discussions and lengthy citations, which characterise such works. Pandit Sharma and the Madras University have made further contribution to the study of Vedic phonetics respectively by editing and publishing (Madras, 1934) also the Vājasaneyi (VS) Pr. of Kātyāyana. Two commentaries are given in this edition, one by Uvvaṭa and the other by Ananta. Uvvaṭa explains the Pr. with reference to the Mādhyandina texts,

while Ananta, whose commentary is published here for the first time, explicitly mentions, in his preface, that he has only the Kāṇvīya texts in view. As a matter of fact, Ananta goes to the extent of asserting that many sūtras of this Pr. cannot be made applicable to M-texts and therefore must have been intended for the K-texts only. In his book, "Critical Studies on Kātyāyana's Śukla YV-Pr." (Madras, 1935) Sharma has presented the results of his investigations into several aspects of that text. He shows that Kātyāyana has recorded in his Pr. not only the rules regarding the correct pronunciation and accentuation of VS-texts but also the peculiarities in recitation of certain teachers and Śākhās. According to him this Pr. is directly connected with the saṁhitā, pada, and krama texts of the Śukla YV and supplies a systematic and methodically arranged account of euphonic changes and combinations, besides occasionally adding phonological discussions. He deals with a number of other topics such as the origin of Pr., authors mentioned in the text, Pr. and Pāṇini, Uvvaṭa's commentary and minor treatises on Śukla YV-texts. The Puspasūtra, which is a Pr. of SV, was edited by Pandit Dravid with the commentary of Ajātaśatru and issued in the Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series (Benares, 1923). Except for the commentary this work does not show much improvement upon Simon's edition of the text with German translation. But the critical edition of the "Ṛktantra," which is also a Pr. of SV, prepared by Dr. Surya Kanta (Lahore, 1939) presents a better text than Burnell's edition, because the former has used some new Mss for text-reconstruction. The editor has, in his notes, made a detailed comparison of this Pr. with other Pr. and with Pāṇini. His introduction, commentary, notes, appendices and the Sāmavedānukramaṇī make the work sufficiently exhaustive. The same scholar has critically edited, for the first time, also the AV-Pr. (Lahore, 1939), which is a unique phonetico-grammatical work related to AV. Another phonetical treatise of AV is the Māṇḍūkī Śikṣā. This text was previously printed in Yugalkishore Vyāsa's "Śikṣāsaṁgraha" (Benares, 1893). Bhagavaddatta's edition of the Māṇḍūkī Śikṣā (Lahore, 1921) gives variant readings from three Mss. In his introduction the editor deals with topics like the relation of this Śikṣā, to RV-Pr. and Yāska, the age of the existing Śikṣās, and the references, in Vedic literature, to Maṇḍūka. According to Bhagavaddatta the major part of the Māṇḍūkī Śikṣā is derived from other similar manuals. The AV–Dantyoṣṭhavidhi, which is the fourth lakṣaṇa-treatise of AV and is a phonetical text relating to that Veda, was

issued by Ram Gopal Shastri at Lahore (1921), which place has recently become, thanks to the Ārya Samāja, a great centre of Vedic studies in India.

The University of Calcutta published, in 1938, M. Ghosh's critical edition of the "Pāṇinīya Śikṣā or Śikṣā Vg." Weber had published its text based on two recensions in "Indische Studien," as early as 1858. But accumulation of new materials and recent researches necessitated a new edition. Dr. Siddheshwar Verma used three recensions in his work, but Ghosh has given the text in all its five recensions, together with two commentaries and translation and notes. The Śikṣā so reconstituted contains certain features, which according to the editor, help to place it in a period before 500 B. C. In his paper on another Vg.-text, "Chando-Vedāṅga of Piṅgala" (*IHQ*, VII), M. Ghosh has discussed the problems of the identification of the work and its date. A reference may be made, in this context, also to the "Vedāṅga-Jyotiṣa" critically edited by Dr. Shamashastri (Mysore, 1938) together with English translation and Sanskrit commentary.

Besides the Vedāṅga texts mentioned above, a considerable amount of subsidiary exegetical material connected with the Veda has been critically and scientifically explored during recent years. The Atharvavedīya Pañcapaṭalikā, which is an ancient anukramaṇī of AV, is the third lakṣaṇa-treatise of that Veda, and was known only through a number of excerpts from it given in Pandit's edition of AV and Whitney's translation. From only two Mss, Bhagavaddatta reconstructed the whole text and issued it (Lahore, 1920) with introduction and notes in Hindi. Topics such as the *uktānukta*, the divisions of AV, the *avasānas* in the text etc. have been methodically treated in this anukramaṇī and its value for the textual criticism of the AV is quite obvious. The Bṛhat-sarvānukramaṇī of AV (Lahore, 1922), already noticed by Weber, corresponds to Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī of RV and contains eleven paṭalas. In the introduction, the editor, Ram Gopal Shastri, has expressed his views regarding the antiquity of AV and the influence which it wielded upon the religion of early Egypt. Further, according to him, the word *chandāṁsi*, in early texts, denotes not only RV but AV also. J. Scheftelowitz has given a critical notice (*Z I I*, 1922) of the Kashmir recension of Kātyāyana's RV-Sarvānukramaṇī. The RV-anukramaṇī of Mādhavabhaṭṭa, son of Veṅkaṭārya, edited by Dr. Raja (Madras, 1932) contains verses introducing each aṣṭaka and adhyāya found in some Mss of the Ṛgarthadīpikā of Mādhava, whom

Sāyaṇa quotes in his commentary on RV X. 86. 1. The verses cannot however be said to form a proper anukramaṇī. They merely deal with some topics of general character, namely, accent, verbs, nipātas, āvṛtti, ṛṣis, metre, deities and interpretation, and are artificially divided into eight sections corresponding to eight aṣṭakas. In the introduction to this edition prepared from six Mss, Raja discusses the question regarding the identity etc. of the author. There existed, according to Raja, another " Ṛgvedānukramaṇī " by a different Mādhava, mentioned by Devarāja, and a part of a tentative text of the same, based as it is on one defective Ms, is appended to this edition. Dr. Raghu Vira has reconstructed (*JRAS*, 1932), from one single Ms, the text of the " Chandonukramaṇī of the Maitrāyaṇī-saṁhitā," which forms a part of the Varāha Pariśiṣṭas.

A work of unique interest, in this branch, is Kohlbrugge's " AV-pariśiṣṭa über Omina " (Wageningen, 1938). It presents systematically, in German translation, such passages of the AV-pariśiṣṭa as bear upon omens and portents. The material is classified in different sections, such as, earthquake, meteor, lightning, portents connected with crop, trees and quadrupeds, tornado etc. The numerous citations, from works like Adbhuta-Br., Adbhuta-sāgara and Adbhuta-adhyāya, supplied by the author, in several places, make the book a valuable manual for the ethnological and anthropological study of ancient India.

Commentaries: Pischel and Geldner have expressed in unequivocal terms their opinion that in the matter of Vedic exegesis greater reliance ought to be placed on the orthodox Indian tradition, represented by Yāska and Sāyaṇa, than on modern philological methods. Linguistics will help one at the most to understand the bare meaning of a Vedic word, but the spirit behind that word will not be adequately realised without due appreciation of the indigenous tradition. The impression was, till lately, prevailing that Sāyaṇa (S) was the only commentator of RV after Y, the intervening exegetical tradition being completely unknown. The period under review is however characterised by the discovery and publication of a large number of hitherto unknown commentaries on Vedic texts—both pre-Sāyaṇa and post-Sāyaṇa. The bhāṣya of Sk. and the dīpikā of Veṅkaṭa Mādhava (VM) have been issued, as mentioned above, by Pandit Sambasiva Shastri (Trivandrum, 1929) in his edition of the Ṛk-Saṁhitā. Dr. C. K. Raja has also published the commentary of Sk. on the first aṣṭaka of RV (Madras, 1935). Sk. gives new meanings of Vedic words, which are distinctly better than those of Sāyaṇa.

His preface also is short and to the point. According to Raja ("A note on Śākapūṇi," Kuppusvami Shastri Comm. Vol., Madras, 1935), Śākapūṇi was the author of a Nirukta, which was prior to Y's N, and Sk. and Mādhava had direct access to that work. Dr. Raja has brought out a new commentary by one Mādhava on the first four adhyāyas of RV, called, " Ṛgvedavyākhyā Mādhavakṛtā " (Adyar, 1939). This Mādhava is a different person from his namesake, the son of Veṅkaṭārya, and the author of another commentary on RV, called " Ṛgarthadīpikā ". This text of the " Ṛgvedavyākhyā " is based on one single exceedingly corrupt palm-leaf MS, and is therefore of little practical use in spite of the emendations suggested by the editor. A part of the " Ṛgarthadīpikā " is also given in this edition. Best Mss-material for the reconstitution of of the " Ṛgarthadīpikā " of Mādhava, son of Veṅkaṭārya, is said to be available at Lahore ; and Dr. Sarup has planned an edition of RV, with this commentary, two volumes of which are already out. This Mādhava must have been the same, who is referred to by Sāyaṇa in his bhāṣya on RV X. 86. 1. According to Sarup, a comparison of this commentary with the interpretations given by S, Sk., Y etc. reveals that VM usually offers more scientific explanations of the obscure passages of RV. He further maintains that S has largely drawn upon VM's " Ṛgarthadīpikā ". The works of other commentators like Śatrughnamiśra, the author of "Mantrārthadīpikā " (Benares, 1934) and Udgīthācārya, the author of a pre-Sāyaṇa commentary on the RV (Lahore, 1935) have also been recently brought to light. Mr. Narahari has tried to fix up (*Adyar Lib. Bull.*, V) the dates of two other commentators on RV, namely, Caturvedasvāmin and Rāvaṇa, whom he places between 1477 and 1507 and the middle of the 15th century respectively. Dr. Raja has written a critical note (VI. AIOC) on the so-called Valabhi school of Vedabhāṣyakāras comprising Sk., Nārāyaṇa, Udgītha, Maheśvara, Mādhava and Harisvāmin. In another paper (V. AIOC) the same scholar undertakes to determine the chronology of all the known commentators on RV and N.

The practice seems to have been in vogue formerly to produce collections of mantras intended for distinct classes of Sāmavedins. A mention may be made, in this connection, of the "Chāndogyamantrabhāṣya", which is a commentary, by one Guṇaviṣṇu, on select Vedic mantras, and which is edited and published by D. M. Bhattacharya (Calcutta, 1930). According to the editor, Guṇaviṣṇu lived before Sāyaṇa, though this view is recently controverted by

A. Venkatasubbiah (*JOR*, IX). At any rate Guṇaviṣṇu was not the first to comment on such selections. Nārāyaṇa, the author of "Karmapradīpa", and Bhavadeva seem to have preceded Guṇaviṣṇu. Nugaḍācārya, however, was the first scholiast, to start the practice of commenting only on a particular portion of the Veda. Halāyudha, in his "Brāhmaṇasarvasva", mentions and follows Nugaḍācārya.

Apart from the publication of these commentaries on Vedic texts, several minor problems connected with them have been dealt with by scholars. D. Sharma maintains, in his paper, "The Authorship of the Vedabhāṣyas" (*COJ*, II), that Mādhava was at least a part author of the commentary whose authorship is at present attributed to his brother and coworker, Sāyaṇācārya. A similar view was already put forth by Dr. Gune (Asutosh Comm. Vol., 1927), who asserted that the so-called Sāyaṇabhāṣya was not the work of one man, but that several scholars must have collaborated, each collaborator having taken up one aṣṭaka or perhaps half of it, as a unit to work upon. Mr. Kashikar has attempted a comparative text-critical study of the RV–Saṁhitā and the Sāyaṇabhāṣya (*NIA*, V). The problem of the mutual relationship between Sāyaṇa, Mādhava and Veṅkaṭamādhava has been approached, from two different points of view, by Dr. Raja (VI. AIOC) and A. Venkatasubbiah (*JOR*, X). All this work with regard to the commentaries on Veda has brought out one fact very prominently, namely, that ever since the time of Yāska there has been an unbroken, more or less uniform and continuous tradition of orthodox Vedic exegesis.

Vedic Lexicons : Works of lexicographical character, such as indexes, dictionaries and concordances form the very basis of modern scientific research. It is therefore quite in the fitness of things that a considerable amount of such literature should have been produced during recent years. R. Simon's "Index Verborum zu L. von Schröder's Kāṭhakam-Ausgabe" was published in 1912 (Leipzig) and a similar word-index to the Taittirīya Saṁhitā, prepared by Parashuram Shastri, was issued by the B. O. R. I. in 1930. The "Vedic Kośa" planned by Hansaraja is to comprise a concordance of all the etymologies and meanings of Vedic words, attributes of different devatās, scientific and moral passages and other useful material contained in the fifteen printed Brāhmaṇas. The first volume (Lahore, 1926) contains an introduction by Bhagavaddatta dealing with several topics connected with the Br.–literature, and a concordance of the more important words used in the published Brāhmaṇas with their context and in some cases brief glosses. The

Vishveshwarananda Vedic Research Institute of Lahore has launched two huge projects of great lexicographical value. The Vaidika-śabdārtha-pārijāta, edited by Vishvabandhu Shastri, the first fasciculus of which was published in 1929, is planned to be a Vedic dictionary in the form of a critical and trilingual record of ancient and modern interpretations of Vedic words, with textual citations and philological cognations. The Vaidika-padānukrama-kośa, edited by the same veteran Vedist, aims, on the other hand, at supplying a universal vocabulary-register of about 400 available Vedic and sub-Vedic texts, together with relevant etymological and grammatical discussions. The second volume of this work, which is issued in two parts (Lahore, 1935–36), concerns itself with the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka texts. A concordance of all the sentences occurring in the different Upaniṣads has been prepared by Mr. G. S. Sadhale in his " Upaniṣad-vākya-mahākośa " (Bombay, 1940). The editor has taken into account 125 published and nearly 100 unpublished Up.-texts, though all of them cannot be said to have been either ancient or important. Besides helping one to trace the Up.-quotations to their original sources, this Kośa will throw some light on the extent of mutual indebtedness among the Upaniṣads. Of course for a comparative study of the several Up. Jacob's concordance is far more useful. The index-volume to S. B. E. Series prepared by Winternitz (London, 1925) is, as a matter of fact, a concise dictionary of eastern religion and its importance to a student of Veda is quite obvious. Such is also the " Dharma-Kośa " (Wai, 1937) which is a lexicographical history of Hindu religious, domestic, social and political law.

Turning now to dictionaries proper it is very encouraging to see that a " Neudruck " of Grassmann's " Wörterbuch zum RV " was required to be issued in 1936. Ever since its publication in 1873, from the point of view of usefulness, Grassmann's Wörterbuch has claimed a place, in the field of Sanskrit philology, only second to Petersburg lexicon. Thanks to the brilliant contributions of Roth, Bergaigne, Oldenberg, Pischel, Geldner and many others, remarkably great progress had been made in Vedic philology since Grassmann's times. In " Zum Wörterbuch des RV " (Leipzig, 1924), W. Neisser undertakes to sift, criticise and summarise the results of RV–study, by way of supplementing Grassmann's WB. In his excellent review of Neisser's work (*JAOS*, 1925) Bloomfield has rightly called it a history and critique of RV–interpretation since Grassmann's time. In the same review Bloomfield himself has dis-

cussed a few important Vedic words like *vidatha*, *ari*, *arya* etc. According to him the best way to get at the central idea of a Vedic word is to consider,, first of all, passages which are not enveloped in what he calls ' Vedic haze.' The " Vedic Concordance " prepared by Bloomfield (1906) may be properly said to have opened a new line of research in the field of Vedic philology. Out of nearly 90,000 entries contained in that huge work, not far from a third occur more than once, and, from among the repeated text-units, again, one third show variations. A comprehensive study of the variant readings of these 10,000 or so repeated mantras was undertaken by Bloomfield himself and his pupils. These variations are found to concern phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax etc. As a matter of fact, as the editors of this enormous undertaking claim, there is hardly any important paragraph in Vedic grammar or a department of textual criticism and exegesis of the Veda, on which they fail to throw light. In the first volume of the " Vedic Variants " (1930), edited by Bloomfield and Edgerton, a thorough examination is undertaken of the cases where the quotations from the saṁhitās show deviations from the *textus recepti* in their verbs. Many of these are merely the result of carelessness or slip of memory. But many others give us an indication of the sense—right or wrong—in which the ritualists using them understood the Vedic passages. This volume and the second volume (1932) dealing with phonetics and phonology have indeed given rise to several interesting observations regarding Vedic grammar and linguistic psychology in general. The third volume (1934), in the preparation of which Emeneau has collaborated with Edgerton, aims at presenting all variations in the inflected forms of nouns and pronouns in the repeated mantras of the Veda with some slight exceptions. The material divides itself into formal variants and syntactic and stylistic variants. All these variants illumine the ways in which the whole stock of mantra-material was reworked in the course of centuries. As L. C. Barret points out in his review of the work (*JAOS*, 1931), in textual criticism, the "Vedic Variants" is a book, which will have to be literally a handbook for the editor of a Vedic text.

In spite of so much magisterial work in this branch of Vedic studies, there did not exist, till very recently, any etymological dictionary of Vedic Sanskrit. Uhlenbeck's " Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache " (Amsterdam, 1899) needed much addition and improvement. Dr. W. Wüst has planned

a most elaborate etymological dictionary of the Sanskrit language, which is estimated to comprise over 1,000 pages, and which will thus become bigger than any such dictionary of a single Indo-European language. The first fascicule of Wüst's "Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen (Altindischen)" was published at Heidelberg in 1935. In a 'Vorrede' of 124 pages, which forms, by itself, one of the best manuals of linguistic methodology, the learned editor deals mainly with the development of the science of etymology. He has also included therein a specimen-study of the word, *cākṣma*. The main part of the dictionary consists of a detailed record of all previous discussions with regard to the etymology and meaning of each word or form, and Wüst's own conclusions in that connection. A very valuable feature of the work is the very exhaustive classified bibliography extending over sixty pages. Wüst seems to prefer the name 'Altindoarisch' to the usual 'Altindisch', because, according to him, not all languages spoken in India have been or are 'indisch' in the linguistic sense. This monumental work undertaken by Wüst will, when completed, undoubtedly rank, in the field of Sanskrit studies, with the Petersburg lexicon, Grassmann's "Wörterbuch" and Wackernagel's "Altindische Grammatik".

Vedic Exegesis: The methods adopted by scholars in the matter of Vedic exegesis largely depend on the views held by them about the origin and nature of the Veda. Even in Yāska's time, there seem to have existed two principal schools of interpretation—the *nairukta* or naturalistic and *aitihāsika* or historical. In the early part of the so-called modern period of Vedic studies also we find two schools of Vedic exegesis, one represented by Roth, Benfey, Grassmann and Kaegi, and the other by Pischel, Geldner and Sieg. According to the first group of scholars, the RV was preeminently an Indo-European document, having very little to do with India proper; their investigations are therefore based mainly on comparative philology and comparative mythology. Pischel and Geldner have, on the other hand, emphasised the predominantly Indian character of these literary monuments, and have accordingly sought light from the orthodox Indian tradition. They raised the slogan, 'Indien—und damit allerdings auch der RV—den Indern." In determining the meaning of a word, A. Bergaigne has relied upon the comparison of analogous formulas. He starts with the assumption that mythology and cult of the Vedas are so interdependent that one cannot be explained without the help of the other. Even during

recent years several theories have been put forth as regards the methodology of Vedic exegesis. Writing about "The Greatness of Indian Literature" (*CR*, 58), Aurobindo Ghose maintains that the Veda is a mystic and symbolic poetry. The Vedic poets had another morality than ours, their use of images is of a peculiar kind and an antique cast of vision gives a strange outline to their substance. To say that the Veda is full of childish and silly conceptions, that it is tedious and commonplace, that it represents human nature on a low level of selfishness and worldiness amounts, according to Ghose, to putting our own mental conceptions into the words of the Ṛsis. J. Hauer too seems to support this view when he says that the mysticism of the AV can be best understood only if it is approached in the right philosophic spirit (Winternitz Comm. Vol., 1933). In his article, "The Vedas and Adhyātma tradition" (*IC*, V), Mr. Agrawala holds a plea for the recognition of the adhyātmavid-school and the readjustment of the canons of research to that end. Dr. A. K. Coomarswamy has struck quite a new path in his "A new Approach to the Vedas: An essay in Translation and Exegesis" (London, 1933). He assumes that, for the understanding of Veda, knowledge of Sanskrit, however profound, is not sufficient. A thorough study of the mystics of the world from the point of view of universal tradition will afford greater enlightenment for the realisation of the spirit of the Veda. The same line of thought is further developed by Coomarswamy in his "The RV as Land-náma-Bók" (London, 1935). The supposition that the Vedic mantras represent a tradition of a historical 'Wanderung' of the Aryans in India is indeed false. Such interpretation is only euhemeristic. As a matter of fact what we find in Veda is an original metaphysical tradition. The Aryans are pioneers not of conquest and settlement but of law and order. Even the apparently objective conceptions like *nauḥ*, *setu*, *yajña*, *saravsatī* etc. conceal behind them a deeper significance. It is, of course, difficult to be convinced by Coomarswamy's arguments. Mr. M. Chatterji puts forth another theory regarding the origin and the nature of the Vedas in his paper, "The Vedic Divisions" (*JASB*, 1930). According to him, the division of Veda into AV, YV, SV and RV represents four different stages of the society, indicating the great intellectual advance in search after truth. Prof. K. Nilkantashastri has produced evidence from the Purāṇas in favour of the *Pauruṣeyatva* of Veda (IV. Ind. Hist. Con., 1940). In the Vāyu-P (59-56) we are told that the Vedic hymns and texts were products of

human effort and are a reflection of critical and significant situations in the life of man in society. As a reaction against the uncritical and unjust attacks on the Veda by ill-informed foreigners of the early part of the 19th century, the Ārya Samāja has gone to the other extreme of claiming for the Veda a most scientific character by trying to discover the origin of modern scientific inventions in that literature. Curiously enough Dr. Pran Nath insists on the Sumero-Egyptian origin of the RV (*JBHU*, I). He had already put forth a novel theory regarding the Aryan immigration in India (*Ill. Weekly of India*, July-Aug. 1935) but his conclusions are based on linguistic monstrosities. For instance he connects *cid* with Shir, *armaka* with Armaens and *śardha* with Chaldea.

All these different views are mentioned here to indicate with what great circumspection one has to proceed in the field of Vedic exegesis. A comparison of two papers on the subject, namely, " The Principles to be followed in translating and interpreting RV ", one by Macdonell (RGB Comm. Vol., 1917) and the other by Dr. Patel (VIII. AIOC, 1935), will show clearly how the attitude of scholars in the matter of Vedic exegesis has been undergoing modification during this period. Difficulties in the interpretation of Veda are now much more clearly recognised than fifty years ago, and the bland self-assurance of Max Müller has given place to the reasonable circumspection of Geldner, who said about Veda that ' here we see but through a glass darkly '.

The several theories about the origin and nature of Veda and the methodological principles, mentioned above, have naturally influenced the critical study of individual Vedic words and terms, to a certain extent, though normally comparative philology has been made the main basis of such discussions. It is not possible to give here a resumé of the extensive work that has been done in this field during the period under review. A reference will be made only to such studies as are typical from the point of view of the lines of investigations followed therein. The " Vedische Studien " by Pischel and Geldner is very properly regarded as the standard work in this line and the methods followed by them are generally adopted even by later scholars. Geldner had proposed to append a dictionary of Vedic words to his monumental translation of the RV and, by way of preparation, he was publishing several papers dealing with individual Vedic words and phrases. Similar series of

notes—" Vedica "—were written by eminent philologists like Debrunner, Edgerton, B. K. Ghosh, Kuiper, Lommel, Lüders, Neisser, Oertel, Oldenberg, Rajwade, Venkatasubbiah and Wüst. Neisser has included all his notes in his supplement to Grassmann's " Wörterbuch ", a reference to which has already been made. The first volume of Rajwade's " Words in the RV " was published at Poona, in 1932. Venkatasubbiah has collected his scattered papers in the form of a book, " Vedic Studies " (Vol. I, Mysore, 1932). An attempt is made in this work to determine the exact meaning of the RV-words, *nitya, śunam, indrasenā, śagma, svasara, arati, dan, pṛthak, yakṣa, abhva, admasad, nireka, smaddiṣṭi,* and *padbhiḥ.* Venkatasubbiah adheres strictly to the methods of Vedic exegesis adopted by Pischel and Geldner in their " Vedische Studien ". He has sought to arrive at the correct meaning of these words by carefully comparing all the Vedic passages where the words occur. This is the method of understanding RV-words through the study of RV itself. The grammatical and etymological problems connected with a particular word are consequently passed over. According to him, *nitya* and *śuna* signify both ' dear ' and ' own '. *Indrasenā,* who is mentioned in RV X. 102·3, is identified as the daughter of Nala and Damayantī and the mother of Vadhryaśva. *Svasara* is approximately equivalent to saṁdhyā, and *arati* means ' bright '. The indexes of passages and words, added to this monograph, will indicate the large extent of Vedic literature explored by Venkatasubbiah for a comparative study of the contexts. A similar monograph discussing the interpretations of some doubtful words in the AV was published by T. Chaudhary (Patna, 1931).

Among scattered papers of this kind mention may, first of all, be made to those of Bloomfield. The Vedic word, *dhenā,* which was interpreted by Oliphant as ' heroic strength ', by Hertel as ' heavenly light ', and by Oldenberg as ' milch-cow ' means, according to Bloomfield, a ' prayer ', or a ' song ' (*JAOS,* 1926). *Rujānāḥ* (I·32·6) is explained by him as a haplology for *rujāna nāḥ.* Dr. Bagchi studies the words, *maṭacī* and *pedu* (*IHQ, IX*) and Dr. Bannerji Shastri suggests that Vedic *opaśa* and *kaparda* indicated types of head-dresses (*JBORS,* XVIII). *Śakadhūma,* which originally means ' dung-smoke ', is the king of stars in AV and is identified by Charpantier (*BSOS,* VIII) with the *kṛttikās.* *Naicāśākha* (RV III. 53) indicates, according to that scholar, a worshipper of banyan tree (*JRAS,* 1930). Dumont points out (*JAOS,* 1939) that the words, *anyedyuḥ* and *ubhayedyuḥ,* mean ' on only one part of the day ' and

'on both parts of the day' respectively. J. Gonda emphasises the magical-religious sense of the Vedic word *bhūṣati* (Wageningen, 1939). Hillebrandt's examination of the words *yakṣa* (= magical, supernatural being. Garbe Comm. Vol., 1927) and *brahmā* (= a Brāhmaṇa. *ZII*, V) is typical of his usual thoroughness. Mr. Joshi has studied the Vedic words like *asridhaḥ* (*sridh* = faulty committance of sacrificial rites) and *mṛlaya* (*All. U. Studies*, 1929), and Dr. Apte has commenced his investigations in this line with a study of *mahaḥ* in *maho rāye* (*BDCRI*, 1941). In a paper contributed to *NIA* (1938), Oertel maintains that the word, *asat*, in Vedic prose, signifies 'undifferentiated', 'formless', 'incapable of perception by senses'. V. Pisani has explained (Grierson Comm. Vol.) *yuḥ* in the sense of *se ipsum*. A special mention must be made here of two interesting papers by K. Rönnow. He identifies *krivi* (*Acta Or.*, 1938–39) with an eponymic ancestor of the Nāga worshippers, combined with dragon-demon. According to him the mythical conflict between the Devas and the Asuras reflects an actual conflict between the Aryans and the Nāgas. After a critical examination of the earlier views regarding the word, *barhaṇā*, Rönnow comes to the conclusion (*BSOS*, 1937) that it signifies 'annihilating power'. Otto Strauss agrees with Aufrecht and Roth in connecting the word, *sadru* (AV XV. 7.1) philologically with *samudra* (Ojha Comm. Vol., 1934). An important contribution is made by P. Thieme through his monograph, "Der Fremdling im RV" (Leipzig, 1938) which deals with the words, *ari arya, aryaman* etc. Dr. Wüst sees in the word, *sṛbinda*, an Irano-scythian proper name (Geiger Comm. Vol., 1931) and his explanations of *alaka* and *reku* are also quite thought-provoking. He derives the name *Gobhila* (= bard) from *gubh*—'to speak', 'to recite'. On the whole it will be seen that steady progress is still being made in this field, though much of it is already traversed by earlier scholars.

Exegetical study of complete Vedic sūktas or passages has also engaged the attention of Vedists recently as in the past years. Some of them have undertaken the critical study of certain groups of sūktas in the Veda. The translation with notes of the twenty Uṣas-sūktas in RV, which was prepared by Macdonell, some time ago, is for instance, published in *JRAS* of 1932. The study of the Dānastutis in RV, made by Dr. Patel (Marburg, 1929) and that of 15th kāṇḍa of AV, made by Hauer (Ojha Comm. Vol., 1934) and B. L. Mukherji (*JASB*, 1925), are however important not only from the

exegetical point of view but is so from the historical and sociological points of view also. Dr. Patel discusses the historicity of the Vedic kings mentioned in the Dānastutis, and Hauer and Mukherji deal principally with the Vrātya-problem. Atkins has undertaken a fresh study of all the RV-hymns referring to the so-called solar deities, in order to determine their essential characteristics. His monograph on Pūṣan (1941) and his discussion of RV I. 115, addressed to Sūrya (*JAOS*, 1938), indicate that his investigations are both of philological and mythological import. Among the groups of sūktas, studied mainly from the exegetical point of view, mention may be made of the skambha-sūktas (AV X. 7 and 8) commented upon and translated by Lindenau (*ZII*, III), the Āprī-sūktas by Gadgil (*JUB*, 1935), the sūktas in the ninth maṇḍala (*Bh. Vid.*, 1940) and the Agni-sūktas of the Bhāradvājas (*Bh. Vid.*, 1941) by Dr. Patel, and all the Indra-hymns in maṇḍalas, two to six, by Prof. Velankar (*JUB*, 1935–41). A special reference may be made here to Poleman's view regarding the funeral hymns of RV, X. 14—18, (*JAOS*, 1934). Poleman maintains that the order in which these sūktas are found in the present saṁhitā represents a sort of ritualistic continuity. These hymns indicate a regular procedure of the funeral ritual adopted by the RV-people.

As the result of a detailed study of the famous Vṛṣākapi-hymn (*All. U. Studies*, 1925), Prof. Chattopadhyaya arrives at some interesting conclusions, such as, that the Vṛsākapi-hymn represents a kind of erotic mysticism, that the cult of Vṛṣākapi did not necessarily originate among the Dravidas, that the sun-worship was supplanting the Indra-worship in the Parśu-Yādava community and that the Persians of Iran may have been closely related to the Yādava community of India. Prof. Schayer has noticed (*Arch. Orient.*, VII) an old Russian variant of the Puruṣa-sūkta, and, on that basis, he suggests the possibility of a common IE. source of the conception of the Virāṭ-puruṣa and his sacrifice. J. Scheftelowitz has continued his research into the apocryphas of the RV and has of late made a detailed examination of the Śrī-sūkta (*ZDMG*, 1921). The text of the litany to fortune has been reproduced, commented upon and translated by F. E. Hall in *JASB* (1932). Quite a new translation of a hymn to Savitṛ (RV II. 38), supplemented by critical notes (*Arch. Orient.*, 1931), is Winternitz's notable contribution to Vedic exegesis. In passages like RV I. 47.7, VI. 40.5, VIII. 8.14, H. Lommel sees an Aryan form of magical invocation of Gods, whereby all places and positions, where Gods are

normally to be found, are named (*Acta Orient.*, 1932). Sieg's interpretation of the most interesting, but at the same time most difficult, of the Ṛbhu-hymns, namely, RV I. 161, (Hultzsch Comm. Vol., 1927) and Dr. Patel's exposition of the mystic-philosophical hymn, RV X. 5, will help one to understand properly the problems connected with these hymns.

The portion of the AB containing the legend of Śunaḥśepa has been subjected to a critical examination by R. N. Suryanarayan (*PO*, 1938), and the first prapāṭhaka of the TA has been selected for a similar study by S. Subrahmanya (*JOR*, 1939). In his " Notes on the Kauṣītaki-Br. (*Acta Or.*, 1932), Caland has pointed out the errors in Keith's translation of that Br. (HOS) and has also suggested certain emendations. Besides a similar paper (*BSOS*, VI) embodying the corrections of Eggeling's translation of SB (SBE), Caland has contributed an interesting paper referring to certain problems arising out of the study of that Br. (*Acta Or.* X, 1932). According to him the five chapters of SB at the beginning of the 13th book contain a double treatment of the Aśvamedha sacrifice. The description in the first three adhyāyas agrees with that given in the TB, while the description in the 4th and the 5th adhyāyas agrees with that in the Śāṅkh. ŚS. Caland therefore concludes that SB knew both TB and Śāṅkh. ŚS. Mr. V. S. Agrawala has noticed two corrupt readings in the Gopatha Br.—one in the pūrvabhāga, I. 31 and another in the pūrvabhāga, II. 9 (*IC*, VI). In the first case he emends the text from *ācāryovāca* to *ācāryo vāva* and thus removes the grammatical as well as the exegetical difficulty. In the second passage, Agrawala gets the names of the three Aṅgirasas, namely, Agni, Ādityas and Yama, merely by slight juxtaposition of words. E. H. Johnston has similarly tried (Thomas Comm. Vol., 1939) to solve some difficulties of the Kaṭha-Up. by applying the principles of textual criticism to the difficult passages in that text.

Much need not be said here about the translations of Vedic texts in Indian and foreign languages. One observation might however be made in this connection, and that concerns the change in the method of approach to Vedic literature, particularly on the part of Indian writers. The Vedas were formerly studied, or rather learnt, mainly as scriptures. The present attitude is that of a historian, who regards the Vedic texts not merely as sacred books but also as valuable sources of the cultural history of ancient India. The spirit of acceptance has given place to the spirit of inquiry. Among the translations in Indian languages, a reference may be made to

the Telugu translation of the Vedas by K. C. Rau (Bellary, 1913-15), the Kanarese translation of RV by T. R. S. Venkatakrishnayya (Bangalore, 1913-15), the Bengalee translation of the four Vedas by D. Lahiri (Howrah, 1919), the Hindi translation of AV by K. Trivedi (Allahabad, 1912-21), the Malyalam translation of RV by P. K. Nambyadiri (Quilon, 1925), and the two Marathi translations of RV, one by Chitravshastri (Poona, 1928) and the other by Patwardhan (Poona, 1942). Of course in each case the translation is influenced by the view taken by the translator regarding the origin and the nature of the Veda.

A complete translation in English of the Vedic saṁhitās, which would take into account up-to-date researches in the field of Vedic exegesis, is still a desideratum. A remarkable attempt in this direction is at present being made by the Indian Research Institute of Calcutta. In his English translation of RV (Bengalore, 1925-28), H. Wilson follows more or less uncritically the commentary of Sāyaṇa. Durga Prasad has given a literal English translation of the Vedas (Lahore, 1912-20), but his view-point seems to be coloured by the Ārya Samāja ideology. The only other English translation of the complete saṁhitās is that by R.T.H. Griffith, whose services to Vedic philology, in its early stages in this country, have been most admirable. New editions of his translation of RV and SV, together with popular commentaries, have recently been made available (Benares, 1926) and they still remain the only guides for the University students, who do not know any other European language than English.

Geldner's German translation of RV-saṁhitā is the most welcome event in the recent history of Vedic studies. Even the published portion of it (Leipzig, 1923), which contains the translation of the first four maṇḍalas amply testifies to the magisterial character of the whole work. Indeed no other scholar could have been found worthy for this huge and responsible task than Geldner, who had already proved his absolute mastery over the intricasies of Vedic exegesis. The critical notes supplied by Geldner in his work are no less important than the translation itself. The Ms of the remaining part of the translation is, it is said, in the possession of the authorities of the Harvard Oriental Series, through which it is likely to be published before long. One may say, without fear of contradiction, that Geldner's translation of RV and Oldenberg's "Prologomena" and "Noten" will serve as the indispensable foundations of all future research about RV. A reference may be made,

in this connection, also to Grill's excellent German translation of the "Hundert Lieder" of AV, a smaller edition of which is published in 1932 (Friedrichssegen). V. Papesso's "Inni dell' RV" (Bologna, 1929) and "Inni dell' AV (Bologna, 1933), which give the Italian translation, with commentary, of some select passages from RV and AV, together with short essays dealing with the general nature and contents of those Vedas, and L. Renou's "Hymnes et prières du Veda" (Paris, 1938), in which that scholar gives the French translation of several Vedic passages, will serve as useful introduction to Vedic texts in those languages.

The Up.-texts have quite naturally greater attraction for the translator than the saṁhitās and Br. Apart from the fact that they are limited in extent, the Up. command universal appeal. Consequently one comes across numerous translations of the different Up.-texts, not only in Indian languages, but in almost all important languages of the world. Some typical translations in European languages are the Polish translation of Chāndogya, Kena, Kaṭha, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Paramahaṁsa, Kaivalya and Narasiṁha by Michalski-Iwienski (Krakau, 1924), the French translation of Chā. (Paris, 1930) and Bṛhadā. (Paris, 1934) by E. Senart, the Italian translation of Bṛhadā. and Kaṭha (1932) by Belloni-Filippi and of Talavakāra and Māṇḍūkya by Carpani, published in the Italian journal *Samādhi* (Bologna, 1935-36), and the German translation of Śvetāśvatara by Hauschild (Leipzig, 1927) and of Kaṭha by Otto (Berlin, 1936).

Chronology of Vedic-texts: The problem of the chronology of Vedic texts has engaged the serious attention of scholars throughout the history of Vedic studies. The starting point of all the discussions in this connection was naturally to determine the age of RV, which was universally regarded as the oldest Vedic text. Some scholars have approached this problem from the linguistic standpoint, while others believe that the only way of arriving at a reasonable solution is to go backwards from the more or less definitely fixed dates of Buddha and Alexander. The discovery of the Boghazköi inscription (Bog. ins.) and the recent excavations in the Indus Valley have again given an altogether novel turn to the whole problem. Scholars are generally of the opinion that the question of the age of RV is closely related to that of the entry of the Aryans into India. Geological, astronomical and religio-historical considerations have also played

their own part in this engrossing field. The result of all this is the enunciation of a large number of theories, admirable resumé and review of which have been attempted by Hillebrandt (*ZDMG*, 81), de la Vallée Poussin ("Indo-Europ. et Indo-Ir.", Paris, 1936), and Keith (Woolner Comm. Vol., 1940). Indeed one is sometimes inclined to feel that in this veritable plethora of hypotheses, interesting as they might be, one hypothesis would easily cancel the other. Nevertheless a careful study of all these view-points will give us a clear idea of several aspects of this important problem.

Starting with the assumption that Buddhism anticipates the completion of all the four periods of Vedic literature—the period of stray hymns, the period of saṁhitā, the period of Br. and the period of Up.—and assigning arbitrarily about 200 years for the development of each of these periods, Max Müller had tentatively proposed that the saṁhitās were formed between 1000 and 800 B. C. On the strength of Bloomfield's estimate regarding the RV-repetitions, Whitney thought that the era of Vedic poets must have preceded, even considerably, the time allotted to it by Max Müller. Bloomfield himself proposed (" Religion of Veda ") to place the oldest part of RV about 2000 B.C. In his " Vedic Reader ", Macdonell rests content with moderate estimate of the 13th century B.C. as the approximate date of the RV-period. Dr. Winternitz's arguments, in this regard, are mainly based on the consideration of the several distinct stages in the history of Indian literature, on the one hand, and of the manner of the Aryan expansion in India, on the other (*CR*, Nov. 1923). The activity of Mahāvīra and of Buddha presupposes, according to Winternitz, the completion of the Vedic literature before 750–500 B. C. The Br. and Up., which represent the last stages of that literature, must have needed a long time for their development. All saṁhitās are older than Br., and the RV-saṁhitā, as a whole, is considerably older than AV and YV. Winternitz further maintains that the origin and growth of the RV-saṁhitā must have required a long time, perhaps several centuries. He therefore concludes that the beginnings of the Vedic literature are to be placed nearer 2500–2000 B.C. than 1500–1000 B. C. Winternitz claims that this conclusion is substantiated also by the evidence of the Aryan penetration into India. According to him, the process of the expansion of the Vedic Aryans in this country must have been very slow. During the whole time from the first beginnings to the last off-shoots of the Vedic literature the Indo-Aryan people had only conquered the comparatively small area from the

Indus to the Ganges. There is, at the same time, clear evidence of the Āp. and Boudh. schools of Veda having established themselves in South India in the 3rd century B. C. The beginnings of the Vedic literature have therefore to be placed long anterior to this time. Dr. H. C. Raychaudhari (*CR*, Oct. 1924) seriously doubts the validity of Winternitz's contention regarding the slow process of the Aryan expansion in India. He produces evidence from Br., such as references to Vidarbha (AB VIII·34 ; SB XIV·5·5·22) and Niṣada (SB II·3·2·1), to show that the Aryans had by that time already penetrated into Central India and Deccan. Even the RV–saṁhitā, according to him, shows traces of knowledge of Eastern and Central India. These objections of Raychaudhari are met by K. Chattopadhyaya (*IC*, III). He suggests that the words, Vidarbha, Niṣad etc., should be understood not as names of places but of the tribes. Further he believes that the RV clearly depicts the Aryans still confined to the west of the Ganges. Chattopadhyaya thus agrees with Winternitz in maintaining that the Vedic Aryans took a very long time to penetrate into the whole of Hindustan. But Winternitz's view that the RV–saṁhitā is in its entirety earlier than the rest of the Vedic literature is not accepted by him. Chattopadhyaya asserts that the RV–saṁhitā contains materials from the earliest to almost the latest period of Vedic literature (VIII. AIOC, 1935), which fact however does not materially affect Winternitz's estimate of the age of the Veda.

Keith discusses this question principally with reference to the age of Zoroaster and the history of Indian literature. As a matter of fact after examining various theories in this regard (" The Age of RV", Woolner Comm. Vol., 1940) he feels convinced that the only argument, which would take us somewhere, must be from the history of literature. According to Keith ("Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the Up."), it is not possible to carry Zoroaster far enough back to make any earlier date than 1200 B.C. or 1300 B.C. for the RV reasonably possible. He assumes that the Sūtras date between 400 and 200 B.C. and that the Āś ŚS may be assigned with reasonable probability to about 400 B.C. A date before 500 B.C. may reasonably be assumed for the older Up.–texts. The priority of the Br. proper to the Up. is quite undoubted. The lower limit for the latest Br. may therefore be fixed at about 600 B.C. This leads one to the conclusion that 800 B.C. is the lowest possible date for the completion of RV.

In his paper "RV Orthoepy" (*IC*, III), B. K. Ghosh has attempted a linguistic approach to the problem of the age of RV. He maintains that the language of RV is so much akin to the language of the Avesta (Av) that they may be safely considered to belong to approximately the same age. The language of the Av is again by no means very far removed from that of the old Persian inscriptions of the Achaemenian monarchs of the 6th century B.C. This line of argument gives 1000 B.C. as the date of the RV. Ghosh brings in historical and archæological evidence also to substantiate his view. Ed. Meyer has pointed out that the brachycephalic Indo-Europeans appear in history for the first time in Egyptian sculptures of the latter half of the second millenium B.C. The Achæans are mentioned in the list of prisoners of Ramases II (1200 B.C.). The Mitanni records of 1400 B. C. contain the names of some Vedic gods. All these facts indicate, according to Ghosh, that various tribes of IE people were traversing the regions of Eurasia, circa 1500 B. C. A particular branch pushed on to India after spending some time in Iran. They were the forefathers of the Vedic Aryans. Dr. Woolner had already put forth (I. AIOC, 1919) a philological argument for an upper limit to the date of the RV. A comparison with the Av showed that the Aryans could not have been in the Punjab long before 1300 B. C. The fact that Zoroaster was antagonistic to *daēvas* and that in the RV-hymns we often come across references to *devanid* and *brahmadviṣ* have led Hertel to the supposition (*IF*, 41) that there was a regular conflict between the Vedic poets and the followers of Zoroaster. This would consequently indicate a late date for the RV.

In the opinion of Hüsing ("Die Inder von Boghazköi," Krakau, 1921), the finds of El Amarna and Bog. offer the first definite points of Indian chronology. They prove in a striking manner that, in about 1000 B. C., the Indians had gone to Afganistan from Armenia. And, according to Hüsing, it must have been in Afganistan that the major part of the RV was composed. He even goes to the extent of suggesting that some at least of the hymns of the RV date after 200 B. C.[1] Dr. Kretschmer too has taken his clue ("Varuṇa und die Urgeschichte der Inder", *WZKM*, 33) from the Mitanni records. He

---

1 A reference may be made in this connection to the view put forth, long ago, by J. Halévy. He doubts the possibility of the RV-saṁ. being handed down in oral tradition. There must have existed, according to him, written texts, which fact would place them not before the time of Candragupta Maurya.

accordingly speaks of the 'seats of the Ur-Indians in the north of Mesopotamia' or of the 'Mitanni seats of the Ur-Indians'. All Indians, according to Kretschmer, must have passed through a fore-Asiatic epoch, which has left clear traces in their religion, language and culture. The Vedic gods, Varuṇa and Indra, the god, Kubera, and the game of dice are, among others, derived by the Indians from the Hittites and the Mitannians. The views of Hüsing and Kretschmer are naturally open to several objections. One cannot be sure as to whether the gods mentioned in the Bog. ins. are specifically Indian. Is it further not likely, it may be asked, that the so-called Indians there represented a wave of adventurers from India ? Or they may have been the remnants of the Indians who had already advanced towards the east. Sten Konow firmly believes ("The Aryan Gods of the Mitanni People," 1921) that the gods mentioned in Bog. ins. are Indian in the sense that they are deities worshipped by those Aryans, who reached India and composed the RV. Indeed on this basis he argues in favour of the high antiquity of the great bulk of the RV.

The recent excavations at Mohenjodaro (M) and Harappa (H) have brought forth prominently the question of the relation between the Vedic Aryans and the people who were responsible for the Indus Valley civilisation (I. V. civil.). Since the age of the I. V. civil. can be fixed with reasonable probability, on the strength of archæological evidence, scholars have, of late, sought light from that quarter for determining the age of the RV. In his paper, "Zur Frage nach den Asuras" (Garbe Comm. Vol., 1927), St. Konow maintains that the Vedic Indians overthrew the I. V. people about 3000 B.C., which is also the time when the major part of the RV-saṁhitā was composed. W. Wüst has expressed his views on this subject in a remarkable article entitled "Über das Alter des RV und die Hauptfragen der indoarischen Frühgeschichte" (*WZKM*, 34, 1927). Harappa lies definitely in the field of the Aryan invasion of India. The I. V. civil., dating circa 3000–2000 B. C., has positively an unindogermanic character. RV, on its part, again, does not exhibit even the slightest traces of the Indus culture. On the strength of this evidence, Wüst concludes that the Vedic people must not have come, even once, in direct contact with the I. V. people. The centres of the I. V. civil. were destroyed by some other people even before the Vedic Aryans entered India. The latter saw only the ruins. The early stages of the literary activity of the RV-people ought to be therefore placed, in Wüst's

opinion, between 2000 and 1500 B. C. In an article contributed to the Hirt Comm. Vol. (1935), Hauer affirms that the Indians invaded India about 2000 B. C. Before that, for a thousand years, they lived together with the Iranians as the Aryan people. Hauer would consequently put back the period of IE unity to 6000-5000 B. C. Some other scholars like Dr. Sarup ("The RV and M", *IC*, IV), on the other hand, assume that the RV-period preceded the I. V. period and therefore assign Vedic literature and culture to hoary antiquity.

The astronomical arguments of Jacobi and Tilak have generally not found favour in recent years. It should however be noted that Hillebrandt again falls back on astronomical evidence ("Die Anschauungen über das Alter des RV", *ZDMG*, 81). Starting with the more or less definitely fixed date of the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa and the astronomical reference in the Kauṣ. Br., Hillebrandt comes to the conclusion that the Br.-period has to be placed between 1200 and 1000 B. C. It is again on the strength of astronomical evidence that Mr. P. C. Sengupta assumes that the age of the Br. is between 3102 and 2000 B. C. (*IHQ*, X), that the mean date for the Baudh. rules for sacrifices should be taken as the year 887-86 B. C. (*JASB*, VII) and that the date of the Vedic seer, Atri, is 3928 B. C. (*JASB*, VII). According to Mr. Vader ("Further Researches into the Antiquity of the Vedas", *IHQ*, V), the most active portion of the Vedic period may be carried back to the scorpio period, that is, beyond 15,000 B. C.

Besides the question of the age of RV, there is also the question of the internal and the relative chronology of Vedic texts, which has interested scholars recently as in the past. Hummel has, for instance, attempted to fix the relative chronology of the old prose-Up. ("Die relative Chronologie der alten Prosa-Up.", 1925) while Caland has, in his usual thorough manner, undertaken to throw light on the "Relative Chronology of some ritualistic Sūtras" (*Acta Or.*, IX, 1931). But by far the most engrossing topic in this connection has been the chronology of the RV-hymns. In a paper, presented to the II. AIOC (1922), on the subject of "Literary Strata in the RV", Dr. Belvalkar suggests that a critical analysis of the Nighaṇṭu-lists will offer new evidence for determining the lateness of certain hymns of the RV. Many attempts have been formerly made to fix the chronological order of the RV-maṇḍalas. By employing his 'infinitive test' Brunnhofer came to the conclusion that the 4th

book is the most ancient and the 9th belongs to the latest period. According to Lanman, the 8th is the oldest book, while Bloomfield opines that that book contains late material on a large scale. Porzig assumes (*IF*, 41) that the 7th is the latest family book. Prof. Arnold has applied a novel test, namely, the use of *l* in RV, to determine the chronological stratification in that saṁhitā (Roth Comm. Vol.). On linguistic grounds B. K. Ghosh concludes (" RV Orthoepy ", *IC*, III) that maṇḍalas, 2 to 7, form the oldest part of the RV, that the 10th is decidedly the latest and that the 9th is linguistically heterogeneous. Books 1 and 8 are, according to him, really old but hymns of various groups of priests are collected in them. It will be seen that in spite of so much varied work in this field only very meagre results have so far been achieved. Wüst had suggested (*WZKM*, 34, 1927) that, in view of the fact that Indra, Nāsatya, Mitra and Varuṇa are together mentioned in VIII. 26, there must have been some definite connection between the 8th maṇḍala of RV and the Bog. ins. As a matter of fact he assumes that the 8th maṇḍala is contemporaneous with the Bog. ins. and thus belongs to the 14th cent. B.C. In his learned monograph, " Stilgeschichte und Chronology des RV " (Leipzig, 1928), the same scholar has approached this question from a different standpoint. Wüst believes that it is possible to trace extensive stylistic developments in the RV itself. Following strictly statistical methods he has tried to ascertain how the 17 stylistic criteria of ' lateness ', such as superlative expressions, vṛddhi formations, cumulation of adjectives etc., are distributed over the different books. The order of succession, thus arrived at by him, is, beginning from the youngest book, 10, 1, 8, 5, 2, 6, 3, 7, 4 and 9.

Vedic Rhetoric, Style etc.: A branch of Vedic philology which has been systematically worked out in recent years is the study of Vedic texts from the rhetorical, stylistic, metrical, melodic and similar other literary points of view. A. Bergaigne's contributions, "La syntaxe des comparaisons védiques" and "Quelques observations sur les figures de rhetorique dans le RV", have been made available in English by A. Venkatsubbiah (*ABORI*, XVI and XVII). A similar service has been done by S. B. Velankar (*JBU*, VII and IX) with regard to Hirzel's " Gleichnisse und Metaphoren im RV." Prof. H. D. Velankar has studied the similes of the Vāmadevas and of the Atris from the rhetorical point of view (*JBBRAS*, Vol. 14 and 15). Realising the importance of the RV-similes for the understanding of myth and ritual, H. Weller discusses in his paper,

" Über Vergleichungen im RV " (Garbe Comm. Vol., 1927), several rhetorical phenomena, such as metaphor, paradoxes (VII. 11·5), which originate, according to him, from the primitive way of thinking, ambiguous expressions of mystic-sacramental character (I. 92·3; II. 20·1) and such cases where different senses are possible, from the same word-groups, through different divisions of syllables (IX. 6·5). Weller maintains that most of the RV-similes disappeared in classical Sanskrit. In such cases, where some agreements are noticeable there has entered quite a different spirit. The similes of RV, for instance, exhibit an unaffected naturalness with regard to sex-life, in sharp contrast to the morbidity of classical erotics. Weller has, in another paper, " Zu einigen Metaphoren des RV " (*ZII*, V, 1927), divided the RV-metaphors into two groups—apparent metaphors and proper metaphors. The latter are further classified according to their forms. Tracing the " Development of figure of speech in RV-hymnology " (Kane Comm. Vol., 1941) D. R. Bhandarkar concludes that artificial poetry or Kāvya dates from the Vedic period itself. Dr. H. R. Divekar has devoted some sections in his " Les fleurs de rhétorique dans l'Inde" (Paris, 1930) to the consideration of the notion of alaṁkāra in the RV and the Nirukta. The Vedic upamās can be studied also from another significant point of view. Since many of them are derived from the every-day life of the Vedic Aryans it is possible to use them as sources for reconstructing the Vedic social and cultural life. " The cultural and social conditions as reflected in the similes of the Dawn Hymns in the RV" have been studied by Mr. Pillai (*BDCRI*, II, 1940).

Leumann's "Zur indischen und indogermanischen Metrik" (Wackernagel Comm. Vol., 1924), Kurylowicz's " Quelques problèmes métriques du RV" (*Roczn. Or.*, IV) and Weller's "Anahita: Grundlegendes zur arischen Metrik" (Stuttgart, 1938) are some of the important contributions in the field of Vedic and Aryan metre. In his "Beiträge zur Metrik des Av. und RV" (Leipzig, 1927), J. Hertel maintains that practically the whole of Av. is metrical and connects the Av. systems, derived by him through a detailed analysis of the work, with the metres of RV. B. K. Ghosh suggests an interesting possibility (" RV Orthoepy " *IC*, III), namely, of reconstructing the text of RV very accurately through a careful study of RV-metres. The text so restored—e. g. *pavāka* for *pāvaka*—will reveal, according to him, many important linguistic characteristics. A detailed study of the " Up. Metres " has been made by Mr. G. K. Iyer (*JOR*, 1927). He assumes that the early metrical Up. are of

great importance to a student of prosody. The advance in metrical art, made by the Up. poets, over the Vedic poets is clearly brought out by him.

With regard to the style of RV Shri Anand Priya says, in his article entitled "Some Aspects of Poetic Symbolism" (*RPR.*, X, 1941), that the whole of the RV is permeated with symbols calling forth to the mind of the early Aryans the pattern of universal life in which he and his *psyche* formed an integral part. A reference has already been made to Wüst's learned analysis of the RV from the stylistic point of view. In his Dutch monograph, "Stilistische Studie over AV I-VII" (Wageningen, 1938), J. Gonda deals, in a very scholarly manner, with the repetitive phrases, parallelisms, anaphoras, alliterations and similar other phenomena occurring in the first seven books of AV. The author attempts to explain their significance by comparison with parallel usages in other cognate literatures. Gonda maintains that the stylistic methods of AV cannot be considered merely as poetical embellishments; he analyses the deeper magical and psychological motives which found expression through them. He does not however make it clear whether, in some cases at least, the purely aesthetic impulse could not have worked.

The SV is the most ancient source from which to draw our knowledge of Vedic music. In this fascinating field, besides R. Simon's "Die Notationen der vedischen Liederbücher" (*WZKM*, 27, 1920) and S. Verma's "Studies in the Accentuation of the SV" (VI. AIOC, 1930), special mention must be made of van der Hoogt's excellent monograph, "The Vedic Chant studied in its textual and melodic form" (Wageningen, 1931). The main part of the book deals with the stobhas, that is, the sounds, syllables, or sentences, which are inserted in a Ṛk for purposes of chanting. In the second chapter of the book Hoogt discusses the melodic form, whereby he makes some interesting observations regarding the relationship between the spoken accent and the melodic movement. He refutes, in the next chapter, Hillebrandt's theory about the origin of the stobhas and concludes that Vedic chanting is a form of ritualistic dadäism—of a näive mysteriousness which masks a meaning by means of paraphernalia of form. The author of this remarkable monograph has supplied a useful bibliography of the SV, particularly with reference to the topics dealt with by him.

Not much work seems to have been done in recent years concerning the padapāṭha of the Vedic saṁhitās. The importance of its

study from the text-critical, exegetical and traditional points of view is quite obvious. Particularly the padapāṭha of the RV deserves to be studied in greater details. Dr. Patel has contributed a paper on the "Padapāṭha of the 6th maṇḍala of RV" to the X. AIOC (Tirupati, 1940). According to Macdonell the padapāṭha was not much separated from the saṁhitāpāṭha. All the same Mr. Pillai points out in his paper, "The RV- padapāṭha" (*BDCRI*, II, 1941), that the padapāṭha was never regarded as a sacred text. References in Pāṇini and AV–Prātiśākhya indicate its *anārṣa* character. Mr. Pillai maintains that, in view of the several inconsistencies, the extant padapāṭha of RV cannot be regarded as the work of one single author.

It has been long recognised that the RV–poets have employed several literary forms and literary devices, many of which have been preserved and developed in the classical literature. W. Norman Brown, for instance, points out (*JAOS*, 1927) that the change of sex as a story-motif can be traced even in the ancient Vedic legend of Indra and the Dānavī Vilisteṅgā. Porzig discusses the riddles in RV ("Sondersprache", 1925) and Poucha sees in RV I. 92, Vedic evidence for the workers' song (*ZII*, X, 1936). Some striking principles of literary criticism had been developed in the Vedic period, and some of them have been noticed by A. Sankaran ("Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit," Madras, 1929). In a paper on the "Problems of the Dialogue-Hymns of the RV" (XI. AIOC, 1941) Dr. Bhawe maintains that it is not possible to deny the dramatic character of the saṁvāda-sūktas. They clearly testify to the existence of some sort of dṛśya entertainment in the Vedic times. Bhawe however points out that these sūktas are generally not connected with any ritual. Two distinct characteristics of the saṁvāda-sūktas, emphasised by him, are their abstruse and often mysterious language and their connection with Indra in some way or another. The relationship of these sūktas with Sanskrit drama is critically discussed by St. Konow ("Das indische Drama", 1920) and Keith ("The Sanskrit Drama", 1924) in connection with the question of the origin of Sanskrit drama.

Vedic Religion, Ritual and Legends: Though, in recent years, out of the three noteworthy types of Hindu religion—Vedic, Tāntric or Yogic, and Bhakti—the most ancient cult, namely, the Yogic or Tāntric, is receiving greater attention from the scholars, work in the field of Vedic religion also has been neither meagre nor unimportant. Apart from the books about the religions of India in general

and about Hinduism in particular, which invariably treat at great length the Vedic religion and cult, such as Farquhar's " An outline of the Religious Literature of India " (Oxford, 1920), Glasenapp's " Der Hinduismus " (München, 1928), Barth's "Religions of India" (London, 1932) etc., and many articles on the same subjects, such as, " The Older Elements in Indo-Aryan Religion " by Sten Konow (*Viś. Bh.*, 1925), " The Religieux of Ancient India " by N. Dutt (*Mahābodhi*, 1935), " Religio-philosophical culture in India " by Dr. R. C. Majumdar ("Cultural Heritage of India," 1937) etc., excellent contributions have been made, during the last twenty-five years, to the study of Vedic religion exclusively. Griswold's " The Religion of RV " (New York, 1923) deals, besides anecdotes of RV–age, the RV–age itself, and the RV–literature, with the Vedic gods, including Soma, and RV–eschatology. As a matter of fact this book should have been called " Vedic Gods ", since the RV–cult has been practically neglected. In the concluding chapter of the book, Griswold makes not a very satisfactory attempt of discussing RV–religion from the point of view of Christianity. " Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland " (Halle, 1923) by H. Güntert is far more learned and thorough. It is truly encyclopaedic in scope. With surprisingly able marshalling of comparative philological and mythological facts, Güntert proves his main thesis, namely, that the conception of ' bondage ' is manifested in the RV through Varuṇa–Ṛta–Mitra ideology and the conception of ' emancipation ' or ' release ' through the Vedic saviour–gods. Varuṇa is the Aryan ' Weltkönig ' and *māyā* is his magic potence. Güntert generally follows in the foot–steps of Söderblom in conceiving of a high divinity without the basis of any natural phenomenon. His views about the Vedic gods, Viṣṇu, Agni, Yama, Aśvins etc., are highly thought–provoking and have inaugurated quite a new method of approach to Vedic religion and mythology. This remarkable book is enriched by several useful references and indexes which evince the author's great command over linguistics and comparative religion. Still more encyclopaedic in scope but less original in outlook is Keith's " The Religion and the Philosophy of the Veda and the Upaniṣads " (HOS, 1925). Keith's work may be justly said to be one of the most important publications in the field of Indology in recent years. The title of the book does not give a true idea of the astonishingly wide range of subjects therein dealt with. Keith has, with his usual thoroughness and brilliance, subjected to a critical examination all the earlier views regarding Vedic religion and philosophy. One however feels that he is often

over-cautious and over-sceptical and usually avoids arriving at any conclusions. But as a register of all that had been said, till then, about Vedic people, Vedic literature, and Vedic religion, mythology, cult, magic etc., this work is incomparable. Hertel's approach to the Vedic religion as seen in his " Die arische Feuerlehre " (Leipzig, 1925) is distinctly tendentious. According to him the whole Vedic religion revolves round the central conceptions of light and fire. In his book he interprets some important words from the Veda, like *brahman*, *dhenā*, *yakṣa*, *citra*, *vasu* etc. in the sense, primarily, of heavenly light, and secondarily, of light and fire in general. Even in his other monographs, "Die Himmelstore im Veda und im Avesta" (Leipzig, 1924) and " Die Methode der arischen Forschung " (Leipzig, 1926), Hertel has reiterated these theories which are indeed more ingenious than plausible. It must however be said that he has produced considerable evidence in support of his theories. The second edition of Hillebrandt's *magnum opus*, " Vedische Mythologie ", was issued by Schermann and Wüst in 1927–29. Hillebrandt is neither as brilliant as Oldenberg nor as critical as Pischel and Geldner; but no work offers more exhaustive and systematic treatment of Vedic gods than Hillebrandt's " Vedische Mythologie ". In many cases he has found it necessary to revise his old theories. Hillebrandt puts great emphasis on the identification of Soma and the moon, and he often brings forth the evidence of late Vedic ritual to explain the RV-mythology.

In " Gottheit und Gottheiten der Arier " (Giessen, 1932), Otto has attempted to explain the genesis of the Aryan gods on the basis of his favourite theory regarding the origin of religion which he has enunciated in " Das Heilige " and "Das Gefühl des Überweltlichen". Vedic gods do not owe their origin to the effects produced on the minds of the people by the great phenomena of nature. According to Otto, we find the explanation of the conception of the divine in the specific and *a priori* faculty of apperception of a power, which may best be called a numen. This feeling has various characteristics, such as terror, a sense of otherness, a consciousness of might and power etc., and through it wrath and mercy are associated. Varuṇa is, for instance, born of the numinous apperception of disease in man and beast. The Maruts again are demonic because man knows, before he encounters them, what demonic is. It is particularly from the point of view of the origin and evolution of religious thought that Otto's book is remarkable. Dr. Deshmukh's " The Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature " (London,

1933) cannot claim to be original in any sense. He refutes, with familiar arguments, the contentions that Vedic nature-worship is to be traced to animism and that Vedic sacrifice developed from magic. H. Lommel attempts, in his " Die alten Arier " (1935), a synthesis of the earlier views regarding the Vedic divinities. Varuṇa, Indra, Maruts, Rudra, Pṛśni, Sabardughā and Aditi. His attitude is unbiased and his treatment thoroughly reasonable. Lommel's expert knowledge of the ancient Iranian literature and religion is evident almost on every page. In the introductory part of the book he deals with such topics as the legal, ethnographical, linguistic and historical significance of the word, ' Aryan ', the Aryans and the Indians, and the RV as poetry. Dr. Coomarswamy's main purpose in " The Darker Side of Dawn " (1935) is to discover the origin of symbols and iconographical motifs in the Vedic and kindred literature. Incidentally he gives an exposition of the duality of Vedic deities with special reference to the Titans and the Angels. "Birth of Gods" (*IC*, VII, 1940) by B. K. Ghosh is a religio-philological study. A passing reference may be made, in this context, to Dr. Rele's " Vedic Gods as figures of Biology " (Bombay, 1931), E. Ghosh's astronomical and meteorological interpretations of Vedic deities (*JASB*, XXVIII) and Mr. Shah's interesting articles on Vedic gods (*ABORI*, Vol. 21). Terza's " La religione del RV " (1921), Geldner's " Vedismus und Brahmanismus " (Tübingen, 1928) and V. Papesso's "Vedismo e Brahmanismo" (Bologna, 1931) present plain statements of Vedic and Brahmanic religious thought, based on original sources, and are thus very useful as reliable manuals for the study of Vedic religion.

In addition to the works on Vedic religion, mentioned above, there are several minor studies which deal with some particular aspects of that religion. M. Bannerji discusses the " Aryan attitude to Female-Deities " (*JBORS*, 1939), and Formichi refers to " The Dynamic Element in Indian religious Development " (*Viś. Bh.*, 1926-27). The question of Vedic monotheism is taken into consideration by Dr. Coomarswamy (S. K. Aiyangar Comm. Vol., 1936) and Zimmermann (Srinivas Comm. Vol., 1928.). In a paper on " Origins of Hindu Iconism " (*IHQ*, III, 1927), Venkatesvara suggests that some RV-passages would remain obscure unless resort is taken to iconographic explanation. Dr. Modi, on the other hand, points out in his article, " Idol Worship " (Asutosh SJ Comm. Vol., 1925) that there was no iconism in RV-times. Dr. Bannerji-Shastri seems to agree with this view (*IHQ*, XII, 1936). Sten Konow has contributed

some papers on the Aryan element in Indian religions to *ABORI* (1924-25) and *Viś. Bh.* (1925). In his article, " Beginnings of Liṅga-cult in India " (*ABORI*, XIII, 1931-32), Mr. Sur propounded the theory that phallus-worship, which was of non-Aryan origin, was a flourishing cult in the RV-period. Discussing the word, *śiśnadeva*, which, according to him, can mean nothing but ' lustful ' (*IHQ*, IX, 1933), V. Bhattacharya definitely denies that there are any traces of phallus-worship in RV. It would appear, however, that this question is still an open one !

Turning from books on Vedic religion, as a whole, to independent studies about individual Vedic gods, we come to a branch of Vedic philology, which is full of eternally absorbing interest. In no other field have scholars differed from one another, to such a great extent, even on fundamental points, than this. Several conflicting theories, for instance, have been put forth, during recent years, regarding the essential personality of Indra, who is the most celebrated god of the RV-pantheon. In his paper on "Indra as God of Fertility" (*JAOS*, 1917), after having discussed and discarded Roth's view that Indra is a god of universal character, Oldenberg's view that Indra is a rain-god, and Hillebrandt's view that Indra is the sun-god, Hopkins concludes that, in Vedic as well as in epic mythology, Indra represents a god of fertility as well as of battles. On the strength of the evidence of the Mitanni records, Kretschmer suggestes in "Zum Ursprung des Gottes Indra" (Wien, 1927) and "Indra und der hethitische Gott Inaras" (*KF*, I, 1928) that the origin of the Vedic Indra is to be traced back to the Hittite mythology about Inaras. The Vedic god is merely a development of the god of the Ur-Indians of Mitanni. Kretschmer seems to have however accepted the linguistic connection between the words, *indra* and *nṛ*, suggested by Jacobi and Friedrich (Hirt Comm. Vol.). Anantalakshmi speaks of "Indra, the RV-Ātman" (*JOR*, 1927) while Fateh Singh believes (*JBHU*, 1940) that Indra is the deity of universal light and energy. The latter scholar further points out (*JBHU*, V) that the myth of Indra's birth through the side of his mother refers to the first light of dawn which is visible in a circular way. In his paper, "Indra in RV and the Avesta and before" (IV. AIOC, 1926), K. Chattopadhyaya has examined all the earlier theories regarding Indra and has then enunciated his own theory. Indra's character as a god of war and victory is, according to Chattopadhyaya, the original one. The naturalistic extension of this conception was to transform the killer of human Vṛtras to be the killer of atmospheric

Vṛtras. Indra thus stepped into the shoes of Trita Āptya, who is the original god of rain in RV. The national war-god of the Aryans appeared as Verethragna in Iranian mythology and as Vṛtrahan in RV. This Vṛtrahan further developed into Indra on the one hand and the rain-god on the other. The name Indra, which is linguistically connected with *indu*, is purely Indian. The demonhood of Indra in Avesta is explained by Chattopadhyaya as the result of an individual poet's fancy. The cradle of the Indra-Vṛtra-myth is, according to him, the Saptasindhu country (VI. AIOC, 1930). By far the most suggestive monograph on this subject is " Vṛtra et Vṛthragna " (Paris, 1934) by Benveniste and Renou who are real masters of Iranian philology and Vedic philology respectively. They have critically analysed all the available sources and conclude that, in Av., Vṛtra (neuter) has conserved the only original sense, namely, resistence. According to them, there did not exist any old Aryan myth about a demon Vṛtra slain by an ancient god. There was however an old god, Vṛthragna, the destroyer of resistence rather than the victor of attacking foes, and the Indian myth is a later development due to a combination of several inherited tales with new, partly borrowed, elements. We thus find a confused mythology made up of three main themes—of victorious god, of dragon-slaying Indra, and of the liberated waters.

Still more original are the views expressed by scholars about the intriguing personality of Varuṇa. Betty Heimann starts by saying (*Kant Stud.*, XXX) that the Varuṇa-conception in RV is simultaneously macrocosmic and microcosmic. In early Veda that god seems to have hardly been an independent god—he is only the instrument of Ṛta. According to Heimann, Varuṇa is also the extended cosmic representation of an earthly kingship. In " Zur Frage nach den Asuras" (Garbe Comm. Vol., 1927), Sten Konow tries to trace the development of the Asura-conception and incidentally points out that the religion of Asura Varuṇa, which represents an ethical-religious law, has been greatly influenced by the vicissitudes in the political conditions of the Aryans. The starting point of Kretschmer's views on the subject, expressed by him in " Varuṇa und die Urgeschichte der Inder " (*WZKM*, 33, 1928), is again the evidence provided by the Boghazkӧi inscription. He assumes that 'Aruna' (=sea) appearing in the Mitanni king's version of the treaty is the original name, while ' Uruwana ' in the Hittite version and ' Varuṇa ' in Veda are the results of popular etymology. The Ur-Indians borrowed a god of sea from Western Asia, who is preserved in the form of the Vedic

Varuṇa. In his paper, " Varuṇa, God of the sea and the sky" (*JRAS*, 1931), J. Przyluski derives all the three names, Aruna, Uruwana, and Varuṇa, from the Austro-Asiatic *baru* (= sea). Varuṇa is thus identical with a non-Aryan god of the sea (*baru-Baruna*). Przyluski brings in also the evidence of the legend of king Bharu in this connection. Keith refutes (Modi Comm. Vol., 1930) the theory that Varuṇa's character as god of sea is the original one. He adheres to the Varuṇa-Ouranos-Skygod theory. In his monograph, " Ouranos-Varuṇa " (Paris, 1934), G. Dumézil too accepts that the words, Varuṇa and Ouranos, are linguistically connected but adds that they are to be derived from* *uer* (= fasten). Varuṇa is essentially a god who binds with his fetters and Ouranos is also the binder of the rivals. Dumézil has produced interesting evidence from the myths relating to Varuṇa and Ouranos to show the basic similarity of these gods. Recently Dr. Dandekar has examined (*ABORI*, 21, 1940) all the important theories regarding Varuna's essential character and has come to the conclusion that the conception of bondage—both cosmic and ethical—is fundamental in the Varuṇa-Ṛta-religion. He has also tried historically to account for the rivalry between Indra and Varuṇa, which is patent in RV.

Arbman's monograph, " Rudra " (Uppsala, 1922) is a noteworthy contribution to the critical study of ancient Indian religion and cult. Through an analytic and synthetic study of all Vedic and post-Vedic material, Arbman evolves the theory that in Rudra-religion one finds the mixture of popular element in ancient Indian religion and the mechanised and ritualised religion of the Vedic priests. In his original character Rudra is a gruesome demon originating from the primitive conceptions of death and its horrors. The development of this figure, entirely within popular cult, into Śiva is quite natural. According to Arbman, Rudra of the later Vedic tradition is not a direct descendant of RV-Rudra, but represents a far more original type, of which the celestial Rudra of RV is a hieratic adaptation. Mr. N. Chaudhari considers Rudra-Śiva to have been an original agricultural deity (*IHQ*, XV, 1939), while Fateh Singh makes him (*IHQ*, XVI, 1940) the god of the arctic nocturnal sky of winter combined with the phenomenon of storms. In his monograph, "Rudra-Śiva, " (Madras, 1941) Venkataramanayya tries to account for the demonical qualities and beneficent activities of Rudra. Mr. M. S. Gladstone has studied the Viṣṇu-hymns in RV and has pointed out the changes brought out by ritualism in the character of that god

(Cambridge, 1928). Starting with the assumption that the Vedic god, Viṣṇu, has no counterpart in IE mythology, Przyluski connects him (*QJMS*, 1934–35) with the non-Aryan race, Viṭh, living in Veṭhadīpa in the Deccan. Dr. Dandekar sees (Kane Comm. Vol., 1941) in Vedic Viṣṇu an original god of fertility and shows that there is quite a logical development in the character of that god till he finally becomes the most important member of the Hindu Trinity of gods.

The twin-gods, Aśvins, have all along been a veritable puzzle to the Vedists. Prof. Jhala accepts (*JBU*, I, 1933) the view first propounded by Yāska and later endorsed by Hopkins and Goldstücker, namely, that the Aśvins represent the morning twilight. Mr. Chandavarkar, on the other hand, traces them back to historical origin (*JBU*, III, 1935). Dr. Shamashastri (V. AIOC, 1928) and Mr. Vader (*IHQ*, VIII, 1932) are inclined to see, in these divinities some astronomical phenomena. As usual Przyluski has proposed in his paper, "Les Aśvin et la grande Déesse" (*HJOS*, 1936), quite a novel theory regarding the Aśvins and the Great Goddess. His main argument is based on the evidence of the earlier religious phenomena in Asia. Aśvins are, according to him, the attendant-gods of the Goddess-Mother in Veda. The latter, namely, Aditi, is described as *madhukaśā* in AV (IX. I) and is therefore connected by Przyluski with flagellation and fertility or invigoration rites. The conception of the Mother-Goddess supported by two cavaliers had spread far and wide in ancient times. The name Aditi, for instance, has its prototypes in Anaitis, Anāhita, Anāhid (Iran), Tanais (Asia Minor and Syria), Tanit (Carthage) etc. Przyluski asserts that a group of Austro-Asiatic sounds forms the central part of all these names. He derives the name Nāsatyau also from a non-Indian word *satya* (= horse : *sadam* in modern Muṇḍā), *na* being an affix similar to *na* in Varuṇa. Przyluski's theories are undoubtedly ingenious, but the Vedic evidence would not seem to support them. A reference may be made, in this connection, to Geldner's suggestive article " Das Wunderbare Feuerzug der Aśvin " (*ZII*, V, 1927) wherein he has discussed the *kaśā madhumatī* mentioned in RV (X. 184·3). According to Leumann (*ZII*, VI, 1928), Aditi indicates the unfixed route of certain planets (comets ?). Mr. Agrawala identifies Aditi with the great Mother Goddess (*IC*, IV, 1938).

Dr. Atkins has undertaken a comparative study of Vedic deities commonly regarded as solar, and the first monograph, "Pūṣan in

7

the RV" (Princeton, 1941) has recently been published. Collitz discusses Pūṣan's connection with Wodan and Hermes (Hugo Pipping Comm. Vol., 1924). Another so-called solar god, Savitṛ, represents, according to Venkataramiah, Aurora Borealis (" Savitar or Aurora Borealis ", Vizianagaram, 1941). Dr. Dandekar denies that Savitṛ and Pūṣan are originally solar divinities. Savitṛ is, according to him, an aspect of the god Varuṇa (*ABORI*, XX, 1938–39) and Pūṣan is the pastoral god of the Veda (*NIA*, June 1942), whose later development can be reasonably explained on the basis of what he calls ' evolutionary ' or ' historical ' mythology. Mr. N. Chaudhari believes (*Man in India*, XXI, 1941) that certain features of folk worship of the sun had persisted from the early Vedic to the present times. Prof. Shembavanekar points out that Vedic Uṣas appears as Lakṣmī in later times (*ABORI*, XVII, 1935).

Among the minor gods of the Vedic pantheon, Yama has received a critical treatment in Dr. Barnett's paper, " Yama, Gandharva and Glaucus " (*BSOS*, IV, 1928). All data about that god has been discussed in detail and an attempt has been made to connect him and the Gandharva with the Hellenistic lands and the Near East. Mahadevi Verma has published an independent monograph on " Yama " (Allahabad, 1939). Fateh Singh has explained the Yama myth (*JBHU*, IV) to show that it originated in the polar phenomenon of light and darkness. Collitz has attempted a comparative study of " König Yima und Saturn " (C. E. Pavry Comm. Vol., 1933). A reference may be made here to Keith's paper on " Gandharva " (Coomarswamy Comm. Vol., 1938), where he has reviewed all the philological and mythological explanations of the word and the conception of Gandharva. A similar study of the conception of the Apsaras in the Vedic and epic literature is made by G. Borsani in " Contributo allo studio sulla concezione e sullo sviluppo storico dell' Apsaras " (Milano, 1938). The author accepts the character of the Apsaras as water-nymphs and adds that their appearance as *dryads* is essentially a case of contamination with Draviḍa faiths. A. Getty collects together, in the monograph, " Gaṇeśa " (Oxford, 1936), all material relating to that mysterious Indian deity; but greater emphasis seems to have been put on the iconographic aspect. L. Renou refers to the Vedic origin of Gaṇeśa (*JA*, 1937). Johanssohn's excellent monograph, " Über die altindische Göttin Dhiṣaṇā und Verwandtes " (Üppsala, 1917), makes a remarkable contibution to the study of ancient fertility cult and is full of many useful suggestions. To the Uppsala tradition of Vedic studies is also due K.

Rönnow's scholarly treatment of Trita Āptya (Uppsala, 1927). The same scholar has contributed an interesting article on " Viśvarūpa " (*BSOS*, VI, 1930–32), a demon in RV and chief adversary of Trita Āptya. According to Rönnow, Viśvarūpa was originally a serpent deity of the class later styled Nāgas. Viśvarūpa is an appelative and alludes to his power over cattle and its procreative activities. P. E. Dumont supports Bloomfield's view that Aja Ekapāda is the sun-god and adds (*JAOS*, 1933) that his one foot is a sort of pillar which supports the sun in his journey through the sky.

The institution of sacrifice played a very important role in the Vedic age. Several aspects of Vedic culture bear an unmistakable mark of its influence. But in modern times the tradition of the practical side of sacrifice is almost extinct. Whatever is recently written on the subject of Vedic ritual is therefore bound to be purely theoretical. In his monograph, " L' Aśvamedha " (1927), Dumont offers a systematic treatment of this important sacrifice. According to him the origin of Aśvamedha can be traced back to IE antiquity. While suggesting " A Parallel between Indic and Babylonian Sacrificial Ritual " (*JAOS*, 1934) Albright and Dumont have shown similarities between the Vedic and Babylonian horse-sacrifice. They assert that the Babylonians have certainly borrowed the practice of sacrificing the horse from the Indo-Iranians. A reference has already been made to Dr. Bhawe's work on the Yajus of Aśvamedha. He also points out (XI. AIOC, 1941) that Jumbaka in the Aśvamedha represents some evil spirit and owes his origin to the non-Vedic element in YV. Goosens discusses (*JA*, 1930) a text relating to the Aśvamedha. The IE character of Aśvamedha is now beyond question. Koppers has lucidly analysed all the ideas connected with this IG cult in his excellent book, " Pferdeopfer und Pferdekult der Indogermanen " (Wien, 1936). His is essentially an ethnological and religio-historical approach.

Dumont has described in detail also the Agnihotra in the Vedic ritual according to the ŚS of Kātyāyana (ŚYV), Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin and Manu (KYV), Āś. and Śāṅkh. (RV) and the Vitāna-sūtras (AV) (" L' Agnihotra " 1939). A comparative study of the Vedic and Avestic systems of fire-worship is attempted by Dadachanaji (*J Anth S*, XIV, 1929). " Das indogermanische Neujahrsopfer im Veda " (Leipzig, 1938) by J. Hertel is, like his other books, exceedingly ingenious. According to him a parallel to the new-year-festival is to be found in the Āprī hymns of RV, which the

Br.-tradition connects with the animal sacrifice. Hertel's favourite theories, such as, that Indra is merely the parallel of Agni among certain Aryan clans, and that Agni is the lord of life and death and personifies the heavenly powers of light occur again in this book. Mr. Goswami elucidates the "Philosophy of the Pañca-Yajñas" (*CR*, 1937) and Mukherji discusses the Vrātyas and their sacrifices (*JASB*, 1925). In his paper, "Zur Erklärung des Pravargya, Agnicayana und der Sautrāmaṇī" (*MO*, XXIII), K. Rönnow points out some pre-Vedic traces of ritual in Vedic sacrifice, such as human offering and the use of wine. Dr. J. B. Chaudhari has contributed to several journals (*IHQ*, XIV to XVII; *NIA*, IV etc.) an interesting series of articles dealing with the position of women in the Vedic ritual.

From among the minor details of the Vedic sacrifice, Bloomfield takes into consideration "The Home of the Vedic Sacrifice" indicated by words like *vṛjana* and *vidatha* (*JAOS*, 1928). Dr. Raghu Vira discusses the "Implements and Vessels used in Vedic Sacrtfice" (*JRAS*, 1934) and Dr. Raja examines the words *svāhā*, *svadhā*, and *svasti* (*JOR*, I, 1927). An interesting point is made out by Faddegon (*Act. Or.*, V) who suggests that the stobhas in the Sāma-gāna are the result of ritualistic dadäism.

A veritable compendium of ancient Indian cults, mainly referring to vegetation and fertility, is offered by Meyer through his "Trilogie der altindischen Mächte und Feste" (Zürich, 1937). The Indian deities, Bali, Kāma, Indra and Varuṇa, are studied solely in their chthonic aspects, with copious illustrations from early literature and later ritual and cult tradition. The importance of this work from the point of view of ethnology, folklore, myth and cult is very great. The idea of an Aryan religious cult is emphasised by Dr. Wikander in his "Der arische Mannerbund" (Lund, 1938). He points out that myths are not to be regarded merely as linguistic phenomena. He explains, for instance, the word *marya* not only in the sense of a lustful young man but also in that of a member of particular society vowed to a particular cult. The view-point of the author is quite novel, but his arguments are not convincing. A mention may be made also of Dikshitar's paper on the "Lunar cult in India" (*IA*, 1933), Paure-Davoud's paper on "Mithra-cult" (*JBORS*, 1933) and Shamashastri's "Eclipse-cult in the Vedas, Bible and Koran" (Mysore, 1940).

Some quite interesting studies about Vedic legends have been produced in recent years. Writing about the "Proselyting the

Asura" (*JAOS*, 1919), W. N. Brown discusses RV X. 124 and throws considerable light on the relation of the Devas and the Asuras. On the strength of the evidence of some passages from TB and TS, Mr. Pantulu assumes (*QJMS*, 1937) that Devas and Asuras originally belonged to the same stock but afterwards they gradually divided into two distinct groups owing to the differences in moral qualities and spiritual practices. The legend of Cyavana has been traced from Veda downwards by Prof. Jhala (*Bh. Vid.*—Hindi-I). After having studied the flood-legends of the East, Mr. Vaidyanath Ayyar comes to the conclusion (*JBHS*, 1929) that the SB-flood-legend is the parent flood-legend. In " Die Suparṇa-Sage " (Uppsala, 1921), J. Charpentier not only analyses the several motifs of the Suparṇa-legend, but also makes a learned contribution to the study of Indian legends in general. Prof. Velankar explains the legend of Saptavadhri and Vadhrimatī (Kane Comm. Vol., 1941) on the basis of RV V. 78. According to him Saptavadhri and Vadhrimatī are husband and wife. Saptavadhri is Atri himself and the hymn is an invitation to the Aśvins to a Soma-sacrifice performed by Saptavadhri who remembered the help which he and his wife got from them when they needed it. Mr. H. G. Narahari shows (Kane Comm. Vol., 1941) that there are three different versions of the Śunaḥśepa-legend and not two as suggested by Roth.

Vedic and Upaniṣadic Philosophy: Indian philosophy in general and Up. philosophy in particular have all along been popular subjects with Indian and foreign writers alike. The reason for this, as suggested elsewhere, is the universal appeal which this branch of Indology commands. Quite a good number of works of the nature of histories of and introductions to Indian philosophy, such as those by Dasgupta, Radhakrishnan, Hiriyanna, Jwalaprasad, Chatterji and Dutt, Masson-Oursel etc., have been published during the last twenty-five years. The very scope of such books demands that they should deal with the Vedic and Up. philosophy only to a limited extent. There are however some excellent works which treat that branch of Indian philosophy more or less exhaustively. A reference has already been made to Keith's "The Religion and the Philosophy of the Veda and the Up." (HOS, 1925). Ranade's "Constructive Survey of Up. philosophy" (Poona, 1926) is one of the sixteen volumes in an ambitious series planned by the Academy of Religion and Philosophy. The author's approach

to the subject is entirely unbiased, unlike that of many Indian and some foreign writers. He does not assume an exaggerated estimate of the Up. The whole Up.-material is first of all critically analysed and then presented synthetically under several philosophical topics, such as cosmogony, psychology, epistemology, ethics, eschatology etc. Ranade has thus presented the whole Up.-thought in the form of a philosophical system. His choice of sources, which are given at the end of each chapter, is excellent. One cannot however fail to notice his partiality for the mystical interpretation of the Up. As a matter of fact the mysticism of the Up., as propounded by Ranade, must be regarded as his special contribution to Indian philosophical studies. "The Creative Period" (Poona, 1927), which forms the second volume of an encyclopaedic history of Indian philosophy undertaken jointly by Belvalkar and Ranade, is certainly of greater value, particularly on account of the authors' refreshingly original approach to the Up. philosophy. This work claims to place the Up. in their historical setting. Deussen and Barua among others had already attempted to stratify the Up.-literature into chronological periods, on the basis of style and other purely external features. But their method cannot be said to be quite convincing. The joint authors of the "Creative Period" divide the whole Up.-material, according to its predominant tendencies, into four groups—Brāhmaṇic, Brāhmaṇo-Upaniṣadic, Upaniṣadic, and Neo-Upaniṣadic—the first and the last groups being further subdivided into early and late periods and the second and the third groups into early, middle and late periods. It must however be said that this meticulous splitting up of the Up. into smaller units and arranging them elaborately in chronological strata cannot always be accomplished from an entirely objective point of view, which should be, as a matter of fact, the main guiding principle in the writing of any history. At the same time one has to admit that what Belvalkar and Ranade have achieved in this work is much more scientific than all that has been done in the field so far. In his "S. G. Basu Malik Lectures on Vedānta philosophy" (Part I, Poona, 1929), Belvalkar has followed the same lines of investigation as in the "Creative Period". The purpose of the lectures is therefore obviously philologico-historical rather than synthetico-philosophical. Prof. S. C. Chakravarti claims to have made quite an original approach to the Up. in his "The Philosophy of Up." (Calcutta, 1935), by divesting the Up.-literature of its mystical and religious note and by freeing it from the overshadowing systems of commentators like Śaṁkara,

Rāmānuja and others. He lays great stress on the objective truth of the Up., that is to say, on what is true not only as the spontaneous intuitive experience of an individual but what may be reexperienced and checked scientifically by everyone. The main practical teaching of the Up., according to him, is that both God and Law are not imposed upon Man from outside, but are his own free and active Will—his Ātman.

Apart from these independent works on Vedic and Up. philosophy, several important articles on the subject are published during the period under review. Edgerton has tried to present systematically the philosophical materials of the AV (Bloomfield Comm. Vol., 1920). In another paper, "The Up., what do they seek, and why ? " (*JAOS*, 1929), he observes that by *knowledge* of the truth the Up.-seers expect to master their destiny, wholly or partly, and not by a course of action dictated by that knowledge, but directly, immediately, and by virtue of that *knowledge* in itself, in brief, *magically*. W. Ruben throws some light on the nature of Vedic philosophy in "Zur Frühgeschichte der indischen Philosophie" (Jacobi Comm. Vol., 1926). G. W. Brown discusses the sources of Indian philosophy with particular reference to the pre-Aryan elements in it (Bloomfield Comm. Vol., 1920). In "The Spirit of Indian Philosophy" (*CR*, 42), S. K. Das explains how and why the first flutter of the new-fledged philosophic impulse on Indian soil, which is to be seen in the Veda, clothed itself in poetry of unending charm. Vedic poets 'got' the vision and Up.-thinkers tried to 'justify' it. While estimating the "Life-Value of Indian Philosophy" (*CR*, 63), Aurobindo Ghose refutes the charge generally levelled against Vedic philosophy that it denies all value to life. In a series of articles, "Studies in the Up." (*JOR*, 1929 onwards), Ammal has discussed in detail several topics, philosophical and otherwise, relating to Up. Mention must also be made of the valuable papers on Up. philosophy and philosophers contributed by U. C. Bhattacharya to several journals (*IA*, *IHQ*, *IC* etc.). C. Formichi indicates "A point of agreement between Indian Philosophy and Western thought" (I. Ind. Phil. Con., 1925), while Glasenapp deals with "The influence of Indian thought on German Philosophy and Literature (*CR*, 1928). Dr. Katre discusses "Some fundamental Problems in the Up. and Pali ballads" (*RPR*, 1934). A more or less comparative study of the Up. philosophy and Buddhism has been attempted by Przyluski and Lamotte in "Boud dhisme et Up." (Hanoi, 1932–33) and by Mrs. Rhys Davids in "The Relation between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism" (*IHQ*, 1934).

Among the Up.-texts, the Kaṭhopaniṣad (KU) has been most thoroughly worked out by scholars in recent years. B. Faddegon has given a scholarly interpretation of this Up. in "De interpretatie der KU" (Amsterdam, 1925). A translation of KU, from the stand-point of the general Sanskrit scholar, is provided by J. Charpentier (*IA*, 1928). Exegetical and critical notes on the text are supplied by E. Sieg in "Bemerkungen zur KU" (Garbe Comm. Vol., 1927) and by Coomarswamy in "A study of KU" (*IHQ*, 1935). Glasenapp considers the "Buddhism in the KU" (*NIA*, 1938-39). Otto's German translation of this Up. (Berlin, 1936) is certainly the best in the field. In his "The Kaṭha Up." (London, 1934), J. N. Rawson gives a commentary on the Up. on the lines of the Bible-exegesis. His analysis of the text clearly betrays a spirit of propaganda. Rawson contends that the KU has a preponderant belief in personal deity of grace. Senart's French translation of the Chāndogya-Up. (CU) was published (Paris, 1930) from among the papers left behind by that scholar. Therein he has succeeded in bringing out clearly the primitive character of the thought. Though not very exhaustive, his notes are very suggestive. Senart has not however used the excellent text-critical and exegetical notes on CU by Lüders ("Zu den Up.", Berlin, 1922) and by Faddegon (*Acta Orient.*, V). Further critical notes on the Up. have been supplied also by Oertel in "Zur CU" (Geiger Comm. Vol., 1931) and by Carpani (*IC*, 1937). "A Sanskrit Index to the CU" (*NIA*, I-III) and "A Philosophical Index to the CU" (*IC*, IV and VI) given by Carpani are exceedingly useful for the study of that Up. As the result of a critical consideration of words like *bhallākṣa* (CU IV. 1·2), Przyluski comes to the conclusion that considerable element of popular superstition is embodied in CU and that the authors of CU were outside the pale of Brahmanism (*BSOS*, V). Senart has based his translation of Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up. (BU) on the Kāṇva-recension of the text (Paris, 1934). In his notes he has tried to discover the connections between the Up. and the later philosophical systems. In "Due Up." (Lanciano, 1932), F. Belloni-Filippi gives an Italian translation of BU and KU, which is perfect from every point of view. The philosophical insight of the writer is quite evident in the introduction, which he has added to his work. The Yājñavalkya-dialogues in BU are systematically studied by E. Frauenweller (*ZII*, 1926). Through his English translation of KU (1919) and Īśa-Up. (IU) (1924), Aurobindo Ghose has presented his own original philosophy. A critical study of the IU has been attempted by

teaching character by the University of Bombay itself; and he expressed the fervent wish that Bombay should exert itself to build up such a University, and bring it into vital relation with the civic life and civic patriotism of the metropolis. So long as the University of Bombay spread itself over the whole province, it would not be able to establish intimate contacts between its educational work and the corporate life of the City, and to make an effective appeal to local pride and local interest. As much in the interests of its own self-fulfilment, as in the interests of the rest of the province, Bombay University ought to take an active part in promoting the inauguration of new regional Universities.

The scheme for a University at Poona drawn up by the Shiksha Vichar Mandal was mainly conceived and elaborated by Paranjpe. The cardinal principle of the scheme was to build up the University on the foundation provided by the actual work and activities of existing Colleges. With this view, it was proposed to recruit University teachers from the teaching staffs of Colleges, and to further strengthen the connection between the two, by providing for part-time employment of College-teachers for University work. "In other words, the staff of the University and the staff of the constituent Colleges must be as far as possible coextensive." The University, in the first instance, was to confine itself to post-graduate teaching and research. He thought of post-graduate teaching and research, however, as means to an end; the end being the improvement of College-teaching itself. This, he held, would be possible only if workers in the post-graduate department were available for undergraduate teaching, and those in principal charge of undergraduate teaching had developed the habit of research.

He proposed to meet the financial requirements of the scheme by asking government for a recurring grant of Rs. 1,40,000, which was the amount that government was spending on the maintenance of the Deccan College. The Deccan College, as an institution for undergraduate teaching was to cease functioning, and it was to be converted into the nucleus of the Poona University; its buildings and grounds, too were to be utilised for University purposes. The departments

of post-graduate teaching immediately to be set up were (1) Mathematics, (2) Sanskrit, (3) History, (4) Economics and (5) Marathi. The University Professor's salary was to be Rs. 500/- p. m. The jurisdiction of the University was to extend to all Marathi-speaking districts of the Bombay Province, excluding Bombay City and Suburbs : the schools as well as Colleges within this area being compulsorily brought under the authority of the University. As regards High Schools outside this area, in which Marathi was used as a medium of instruction, the University was to be free to recognise and control them, if the schools so desired. Prof. Paranjpe was of the opinion that Marathi could not all at once be adopted as the medium of instruction, in all subjects and at all stages. Progress towards that goal could be made only by gradual steps.

Such were the salient features of the University as Prof. Paranjpe conceived it. It rested upon the twin principles of growth from within, and utilisation of existing resources to the utmost. It is to be earnestly hoped that these would inspire the architects of the future Maharsahtra University. I shall conclude by quoting Prof. Paranjpe's emphatic declaration about the essential element in the success and greatness of a University :—

"There are some who would not have a replica of the Bombay University. They would have nothing less than a Cambridge in Poona. But Cambridge is made what it is by its Professors, and if we aspire to have a Cambridge in Poona we must raise the level of our Professors to that of the Professors at Cambridge"

A great thought indeed for those engaged in laying out the ground-plan of the Maharashtra University !

Gleanings :—

' Do or Die ' :—

What exactly is expected of us then ? The supreme need of the hour is the creation of the positive attitude of intense patriotism, and all of us must do all we can to foster in the young the desirable ideals of life, which includes first and foremost a passionate love for the Motherland whose call to youth must be obeyed when the time comes. He must grow up to be a healthy, idealistic young man full of vitality, courage, determination and strength of will to resist all wrong and to fight, and if need be, to sacrifice his all for the nation. The youngsters that crowd our schools today have no joy in life, have no particular interestes to move them deeply, they have neither the vitality nor the courage to fight sternly and unreservedly till they ' do or die '. The youngsters are not led to think seriously on any of life's major problems. They are very much left to ferret out facts or shift for themselves because the teachers in most of our schools feel that they have discharged their duties well, if they have filled in the Time table periods and tried to teach a few simple facts in their subjects as per schedule D or their syllabus scheme. We are too pedantic, too much given to formal and theorising and indulging in the dry-as-dust philosophy of teaching and method to look at life squarely and fairly. We delude ourselves with thinking that life's larger canvass is not for the youngsters or for us. We deceive ourselves that those in our charges are hot-house plants to be shaded and isolated from life's hot air or cold blasts. We wish to roam in Elysian Gardens in pursuit of illusory objectives. The pupils must not pry into life's mystery or grim reality at that tender age. We are sadly mistaken if we continue to regard things that way. The child or the school boy does imbibe a lot from his surroundings and atmosphere-he forms his views, his ideas and ideals from here, there and everywhere in any malformed, ill-conceived way that he can in the absence of any positive guidance or help from those who could and should give them to him in a proper way. A thousand pities that such a state should

prevail—it is up to us teachers to wage war against such apathy, indolence, ignorance or absence of positive guidance. We should act positively, regard it as the most sacred part of our duty and to exert our influence to the utmost by our example and precept. The children who come into daily contact with us should be deeply imbued with our healthy optimism, cheerful idealism, intense nationalism and devotion to du.y. As teachers we are to prepare the youngsters for life, this cannot be done by merely teaching a few subjects. Life's lessons have to be taught more practically and vitally.

[Indian Education, Act. 1942.
from Bombay Teachers' Journal']

War and Education :—

There are at this moment in England thousands of quite ordinary men and women who are just carrying on " business as usual, " though being exposed throughout each of the 24 hours to the danger of death or mutiliation—going about their daily business unconcernedly, with a smile in their eyes and a ready jest on their lips. That is the attitude of mind which is of the profoundest significance in education and which we in India need to cultivate at the time of danger. We should remember that victory in the present struggle—not the physical struggle but the infinitely greater one for the soul of mankind—will be largely won in and through the minds and hearts of our children. We too of India must carry on as usual in spite of bombing. One cannot sufficiently emphasise the absolute importance not only of the *maintenance* of educational facilities but also of a strong publicity and propaganda campaign to stimulate demand. *Education must go on*—our future depends on our skill, our knowledge, our initiative and our resource. The war will be won by the side whose *morale* lasts. People must, therefore, be induced for their own sakes as well as for the sake of the nation to take up their uninterrupted training. It is not perhaps possible in Bengal to make billeting arrangements for evacuee children owing to caste and social restrictions, but it should be found possible to start hostels and camp schools in

cities, where there is no danger, for the accommodation of refuge children and to provide for continuity of teaching work which has been interrupted. Politicians say that all of us—men, women, and children—are in the front line in this total war, but they apparently forget that no army puts all its men into the front line at one time—it always retains some in reserve. Our children are the *nation's reserve*—it is therfore essential that they should be kept as far as possible out of the firing line. It is time the authorities speed up their leisurely procedure in the matter of thinking out what should be done for the continuance of our boys' and girls' education in times like the present.

Wheher we like it or not India is heading for a new social order after the war. What that order will be no one can foresee, but perhaps the new order will be as teachers make it now.

[Mr. J. Lahari, Macmillan's Educational Bulletin, October 41.]

The Present Situation :—

In this connection, we deem it our duty to submit our views on the policy of keeping the institutions open when an emotional storm has broken. This policy is directed towards keeping away the students from undesirable activities. But from what have we seen of the results of keeping institutions open without scholars, may we observe that we thereby run the risk of defeating the very object we have in view? With schools open, the boys go out of their homes presumably to attend school. But some of them, instead of attending school, may form groups for mischief whereby they may injure themselves and put the authorities in charge of law and order to additional strain on their account. An effective weapon against a strike is the lock-out. The school, we agree, is not a factory. Even so, some form of lock-out in the way of temporary closure of the school may be more

conducive to the restoration of peaceful conditions than the alternative method of keeping the institutions nominally open during disturbed conditions and punishing the guardians and their wards under various sections of the Educational Code. In most cases the prompt closure of the institut ion followed by the transfer, with due notice, of students to the watch and protection of parents, would result in dispersing youthful patriots to the seclusion of their homes where parental influence would achieve more than could the teacher's rod or the policeman's baton. The best thing that we might do in difficult situation like this one would be to give a certain amount of discretion to the Managements.

May we make an appeal to the Government on behalf of teachers ? No institution, we submit, should be penalised or praised for the indiscipline or otherwise of its students resulting from causes not within the control of the authorities in charge of the institution. Institutions with comparatively bad records of discipline and work may have shone 'in flying colours' during the disturbed fortnight we have passed through, while others with creditable records may have had to close down temporarily to avoid ugly scenes. Very likely the extraneous factors which were responsible for the outburst might have proved too much for the best efforts of the teachers and their Managements. The imposition of disciplinary measures like suspension of grant-in-aid on such institution would mean only punishing their teachers who may have been absolutely blameless in the discharge of their duties.

Education Sept. 1942, Lucknow.

* * *

THE BOMBAY PROVINCIAL FEDERATION OF SECONDARY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS.

1. "The Council of the Federation has decided to postpone the Bombay Provincial Secondary Teachers' Conference this year Sine Die. The question of holding the Conference will be re-considered when the situation returns to normal."

2. The Council of the Federation has approved the report of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider the question of organising the Insurance Scheme for the benefit of Secondary Teachers and authorized the Sub-Committee to consider the concrete scheme as and when prepared by the Company and carry on negotiation till it is ready to be submitted to the Council in the final form.

3. The Council of the Federation has approved the report of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider the question of organising the Co-operative Wholesale Society for Secondary Teachers and requested the Committee to carry on its work and prepare the necessary machinery.

The Council also suggested that the Member-Associations may, under the present circumstances, consider the possibility of organising the Co-operative Society to start Grain Shops for the benefit of teachers.

The Council further suggested that a Conference of the members of the Associations may be called to consider this question.

Mr. D. P. Khattry, Hony. Secretary, All India Federation of Educational Associations, informs us that His Highness, the Maharaja of Dewas (Senior) has kindly consented to inaugurate the 18th All India Educational Conference to be held at Indore (C. I.) on December, 27-30, 1942 and to deliver the Inaugural Address.

The late Mahā Mahopādhyāya Vasudeoshastri Abhyankar

By L. R. RADDI, B. A., B. T., *Poona*

In the death of Maha Mahopadhya Vasudeo Shastri Abhyankar, Mahārāshtra has lost the greatest Pandit of the last generation and there does not appear to be any chance that we shall see his like again. To the readers of the Progress of Education, it may be of interest to know how great scholars were trained in old India, to know especially the environment that governed their making and their limitations as research scholars. It is proposed in this brief sketch to emphasize this aspect of the Late Mahāmahopādhyāya's life, rather than his character and attainments.

Born on the 4th of August 1863, at Satara, he lost in his early childhood his father. In the late Rāmashastri Godbole, pupil of his grandfather, he found an ideal teacher, one whose life and example should always be before our teachers. Ramshastri was a resident of Mahuli, 5 miles away from his Guru's house. He used to come to his preceptor's house early in the morning, where he used to take lessons and later on, after the death of his Guru, give lessons, and used to go back to Mahuli in time for his evening prayers; and this day's programme he followed practically till the end of his life, knowing no other pursuit than that of a scholar, seeking no career, owning no property. It was with such a master that Vasudeoshastri passed his days of apprenticeship. Even as a boy of five, when he did not know how to write श्री, he knew by heart the रूपावली and समासचक्र, because he lived among students, and although from his seventh year he regularly attended a Marathi school, his Sanskrit education proceeded without interuption until he attained his twentieth year, when his Guru had practically nothing to teach him. From his twenty-third year onwards, while still continuing his work as a learner and teacher, he began to write grammatical treatises and practically continued his literary work to the day of his death.

the Language of the Br." (*NIA*, II, 1939-40). Oertel started his investigations into the syntax of cases with a paper dealing with the disjunct use of the nominative in the Br.-prose (Wackernagel Comm. Vol., 1925). His " The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Br." (Heidelberg, 1926) is an interesting essay in comparative syntax. Considerable amount of material has been presented there so as to indicate the relative frequency of any particular usage. Oertel has discussed in this monograph also the conjunct and disjunct cases. In another paper, Oertel considers, on the basis of an amazingly wide range of Vedic texts, the syntactical equivalence of the genitive and ablative cases used with verbs of separation like *apakram*, *utkram*, *vikṣar* etc. in Vedic prose (*SBBW*, München, 1935). Elsewhere he undertakes the study of case-variation in identical or similar contexts in Vedic prose (*SBBW*, 1937). Many of his papers on this subject are collected under the title, " Untersuchungen zur Kasus-syntax der vedischen Prosa " (München 1935-37). Recently he has published his observations on some genitival constructions in Vedic prose (*NIA*, 1939-40). A reference must be made in this section also to the series of scholarly articles on " The Use of the Cases in Vedic prose " (*ABORI*, VIII-X) by S. K. Sen.

Oertel has further studied the expressions for " the year consists of twelve months " and the like in the Vedic prose (*BSOS*, 1936) and the Vedic idiom *satyasya satyam*, which denotes, according to him, the quintessence of truth (*SBBW*, 1937). The compound, *śūdrāryau*, is the subject of another discussion by this eminent professor of linguistics (*KZ*, 63).

In his monograph, " Pāṇini and Veda " (Allahabad, 1935), P. Thieme has attempted a critical examination of Pāṇini's rules regarding Vedic grammar. Through the study of the words like *chandas*, *mantra*, *ṛk*, *brāhmaṇa*, *nigama* etc. used in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Thieme has concluded that Pāṇini was very careful in his terminology. The relation between Pāṇini and the Prātiśākhyas is another important topic discussed by the author. His conclusions in that regard were opposed by B. K. Ghosh, who maintained (*IHQ*, X) that Pāṇini mechanically copied the RV-Pr., perhaps without understanding what he was copying. This contention of his started a controversy in which several scholars like Keith (*IC*, 1936), Chattopadhyaya (*IHQ*, 1937) and Chaturvedi (*NIA*, 1938-39) have participated.

Conclusion : The study of the Veda from the point of view of history and sociology must be regarded as an independent branch of

Indology and may not therefore be reviewed in detail in this survey. The work done in that field is by no means meagre either in point of quality or of quantity. The problem of Vedic history which has most prominently attracted the attention of scholars, during recent years, is the relation between the Vedic Aryans and the authors of the Indus Valley Civilisation. Other important historical problems, which have been systematically worked out, comprise the Dāśarājña battle, the correlation of the Vedic kings with the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas, the Aryan invasion of India, the role of the Asuras and the Vrātyas in ancient Indian history, and the identification of various tribes and geographical localities mentioned in the Vedic literature. The question of the social, political and economic institutions of the Vedic times is now being approached by scholars with a new outlook. Several topics in this field like caste and race, the position of woman, gotra and pravara, state, kingship, republics, village communities etc. have been no doubt discussed ever since the early period in the history of Vedic studies. But more material is being made available in the course of time and the treatment of these subjects is definitely becoming more thorough and scientific. It is further encouraging to see that several technical sciences, like astronomy and mathematics, which were sufficiently developed in the Vedic age, are now receiving an adequate treatment at the hands of orientalists. It may thus be maintained that, from all points of view, Vedic philology has fully established its claim as the premier branch of Indological studies.

Abbreviations

A B O R I	—	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
Acta Orient.	—	Acta Orientalia.
Ad. Lib. Bull.	—	Adyar Library Bulletin, Adyar.
A I O C	—	All India Oriental Conference (Proceedings).
Allg. Ev. K. Z.	—	Allgemeine Evangelische Kirchliche Zeitschrift.
All. U. Stud.	—	Allahabad University Studies.
Archiv Orient.	—	Archiv Orientalni.
A V O I	—	Annals of the Venkateshvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.
B D C R I	—	Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.
Bh. Vid.	—	Bhāratīya Vidyā, Bombay.
Bibl. Ind.	—	Bibliotheca Indica.
B S L	—	Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique.
B S O S	—	Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London.
C O J	—	Calcutta Oriental Journal.
Comm. Vol.	—	Commemoration Volume (Festschrift etc.).
C R	—	Calcutta Review.
Etud. Trad.	—	Etude Traditionelle.
Ges. der idg. Spw.	—	Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft.
H J A S	—	Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.
H J O S	—	Harvard Journal of Oriental Studies.
H O S	—	Harvard Oriental Series.
I A	—	Indian Antiquary.
I C	—	Indian Culture, Calcutta.
I F	—	Indogermanische Forschungen.
I H Q	—	Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
I L	—	Indian Linguistics.
Ill. Weekly of India	—	Illustrated Weekly of India, Bombay.
Ind. Hist. Con.	—	Indian Historical Congress (Proceedings).
Ind. Phil. Con.	—	Indian Philosophical Congress (Proceedings).
J A	—	Journal Asiatique.
J Anth S	—	Journal of the Anthropological Society, Bombay.
J A O S	—	Journal of the American Oriental Society.

J A S B	—	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J B B R A S	—	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J B H S	—	Journal of the Bombay Historical Society.
J B H U	—	Journal of the Benares Hindu University.
J B O R S	—	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
J B U	—	Journal of the Bombay University.
J O R	—	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
J R A S	—	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
Kant Stud.	—	Kant Studien.
K F	—	Kleinasiatische Forschungen.
K Z	—	Kuhn's Zeitschrift (für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft).
Man in India	—	
Mahābodhi	—	
M O	—	Monde Oriental.
N I A	—	New Indian Antiquary.
Phil. Quart.	—	Philosophical Quarterly.
P O	—	Poona Orientalist.
Pr. Bh.	—	Prabuddha Bhārata.
Q J M S	—	Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.
Rocz. Or.	—	Rocznik Orjentalistyczny.
R P R	—	Review of Philosophy and Religion.
Samādhi	—	
S B B W	—	Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft.
S B E	—	Sacred Books of the East.
Viś. Bh.	—	Viśva Bhāratī.
W Z K M	—	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Z Buddh.	—	Zeitschrift für Buddhismus.
Z D M G	—	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
Z I I	—	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik.

*A SURVEY OF WORK DONE, IN INDIA AND OUTSIDE DURING THE LAST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, IN THE FIELD OF IRANIAN STUDIES

BY

J. M. UNVALA

The importance of philology in the study of ancient and modern languages is now well established. It cannot be minimised even in the pursuit of the study of the Parsi religious scriptures, written in Avesta, Pahlavi or Modern Persian languages. The languages in which the Zoroastrian scriptures are written form the Iranian branch of the Aryan group of languages, which is itself one of the nine groups of the original hypothetical Indo-Germanic language, taking into account Tokharian, a language akin to the Celtic group, in which some documents recently discovered in Central Asia are written. The term *Indo-Germanic*, is advocated by German philologists, as it indicates the extreme geographical limits of the Indo-Germanic languages, represented by Indian (Sanskrit) in the south, and Icelandic, a Germanic language, in the north. French philologists prefer to it the term *Indo-European*, and some English scholars still persist in using the inadequate term *Aryan*, which as I have just mentioned, is properly restricted only to the Indian and Iranian languages.

A. Berriedale Keith has recently treated the question of the original home of the Indo-Germanic people in an article, entitled The home of the Indo-Europeans, published in *Pavry Oriental Studies*, London, 1933, pp. 189–199. After discussing Europe and Asia as the probable home of the Indo-Europeans he leaves the question as yet undecided in favour of either continents owing to the lack of conclusive data.

What concerns Aryan, i. e. Indo-Iranian language-group, Christian Bartholomae has contributed a series of nineteen articles in *Indogermanische Forschungen* from 1894 to 1924.

* The following survey forms the major part of the preface to "Iranian Bibliography or Catalogue of books and articles on Iranian literature pertaining to Iran in general and Zoroastrian religion in particular, published in Europe and America since 1894," which I have compiled for the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet Funds and Properties. The bibliography was submitted to the Trustees in May 1941. I am indebted to the Trustees for their kind permission to quote passages from the preface *in extenso* before the publication of the bibliography.

Christian Bartholomae occupies the first place among Iranists by his numerous articles on Iranian researches, especially on Iranian linguistics. Edward Meyer has seen in the clay-prism of Sargon (722–705 B. C.), which contains many Iranian names, the oldest dated proofs of the Iranian language and of the Zoroastrian religion. (Die ältesten datierten Zeugnisse der iranischen Sprache und der zoroastrischen Religion, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, *42*, pp. 1–47). J. Scheftelowitz, Die Sprache der Kossäer, *KZ*. *38* is included in this survey, as the Kossaeans or the Kassites are supposed to belong to the autochthon Iranians, residing in the region of the Zagros Mountains, who invaded and overwhelmed the Babylonian empire of Hammurabi and founded the Kassite dynasty which ruled from the beginning of the eighteenth to the twelfth century B. C. Their language is considered to belong to the group of the languages of the Caucasus, but some traces of the Indo-Germanic are also found in it. (G. Contenau, Manuel d'Archéologie Orientale, Paris, 1927, vol. I, pp. 166–167).

Sorab J. Bulsara considers, contrary to the theory of Friedrich Carl Andreas, the Avesta alphabet to be the oldest one, from which, according to him, even the Egyptian hieroglyphic and demotic scripts had been derived. He has developed this bold thesis in an article, entitled The Origin of the Alphabet. The origin and the high antiquity of the Avestan writing. *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume*, Bombay 1930, pp. 378–404, and Pl. I–III. He has given in these plates comparative tables of different ancient alphabets. The same has formed the subject of his paper read before the XI All India Oriental Conference held at Hyderabad in December 1941. The outstanding personality in the field of Iranian, especially Zoroastrian literature, was Prof. Christian Bartholomae. On the basis of his Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg 1904, Fritz Wolff has translated the whole of the Avesta scriptures, with the exception of the Gāthās, with the title Avesta, die heiligen Bücher der Parsen, Strassburg 1910. A reprint of this translation appeared in Berlin – Leipzig 1924. Viewed in the light of this Wörterbuch, L. H. Mills's attempts at the translation of the Pahlavi version of the Yasna, as published in several numbers of the *J. R. A. S.*, *J. A. O. S.*, and *Z. D. M. G.*, are meagre. He has not often understood the Pahlavi version, just as I have amply shown in my Neryosangh's Sanskrit Version of the Hōm Yašt (*Yasn* IX–XI), Vienna 1924. There exists also a translation of the Vandidad in Italian, viz. F. C. Cannizzaro, Il Vandidad reso italiano,

Messina 1916. I have worked on the same lines as Mills and Dastur Dr. Dhalla and have published besides the Hōm Yašt just mentioned, Neryosangh's Sanskrit Version of Yasna XIX, *Pavry Or. Stud.*, London 1933, pp. 472–481, and a Fragment of the Sanskrit Version of the Vidēvdāt with a glossary, *Indo-Iranian Studies*, Leipzig 1925, pp. 253–276. The latter is a unique Sanskrit version of the Vandidād found only in Codd. Iran. XXX, fol. 182a–195a, line 5. I think that for the correct interpretation of the Avesta, besides seeking the invaluable philological help, the Pahlavi, Sanskrit and Persian versions should also be consulted. The Pahlavi commentaries, especially on the Vandidād, give us a good idea of the views held by Sassanian dastūrs on matters relating to social and religious customs.

Prof. Karl F. Geldner and after him Johannes Hertel have contributed to researches on the metre found in the later Avesta, particularly in the Yašt literature.

Irach J. S. Taraporewala has published in Calcutta in 1922 Selections from Avesta and Old Persian with critical apparatus and a vocabulary for students of the Calcutta University. It is interesting to note that Iranian languages are studied even in Japan, where there is a chair for Iranistics in the University of Tokyo. Prof. Behramgore Anklesaria counts among his foreign pupils even the Japanese. It is not surprising therefore to read A Note on Avesta contributed to *Pavry Or. Stud.* by Shigheru Araki of Tokyo.

D. M. Madon, Study of the Gāthās, Part I, The Gāthā Ahunavaiti, Bombay 1916, and Khodabakhsh E. Poonegar, The five Zoroastrian Gāthās translated with Notes and Summary, Bombay 1928, show the results of the critical study of the Gāthās, as inaugurated by the Gāthā Society, one of whose active exponents is Prof. Behramgore Anklesaria. Aga Poore Dawood has translated into Persian the Gāthās of Zarathushtra and a portion of the Khordah Avesta, viz. the Yasht literature. This is the first attempt at making the Avesta accessible to the Zoroastrians and Muhammadans of Iran in their own language. Thus one of the dreams of the late Mr. Dinshah Jeejeebhoy Irani has been realised.

I have included among inscriptions cuneiform, Aramaic, Greek, and Sassanian inscriptions discovered in Iran and adjoining countries. Père V. Scheil has published many new Achaemenian inscriptions discovered at Susa by R. de Mecquenem in *Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse*, XXI, Paris 1929, among which there is the inscription mentioning the construction of the palace of

Darius the Great at Susa, and the materials and men employed therein, which has been called by E. Herzfeld the *Magna Carta* from Susa in *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, III. I have given an excerpt of this volume in The Ancient Persian Inscriptions of the Achaemenids found at Susa, with a glossary, Paris 1929. E. Benveniste in *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris*, *30*, pp. 58–74 (1930), R. G. Kent in *J. A. O. S.*, *51*, pp. 189–240 (1931), and Herzfeld in *Archäol. Mitt. Iran*, III, 1931 have passed criticisms on V. Scheil's reconstructions and explanations of the text of this big inscription of Darius. I must say that the real credit for the work should go to Pére Scheil, whose reconstructions are made, in the first instance, with a constant glance at the exigencies of the lacunae, and whose explanations of the newly discovered Ancient Persian words are masterly. The trilingual inscription giving the extreme limits of the empire of Darius the Great, engraved on gold and silver plates (13 cm. × 18 cm.) discovered at Hamadan, which I had communicated orally to Herzfeld in May 1926 in Teheran, and then to the Parsis in a lecture delivered in the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Bombay in September of the same year, has been published by Herzfeld under the title A New Inscription of Darius from Hamadan in *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 34, Calcutta 1928. In a foot-note to the first page of this article Sir John Marshall, the editor of the *Memoirs* has acknowledged the priority of my communication. Two pairs of gold and silver plates (24 cm. × 30 cm. ?), bearing the same trilingual inscription as that on the plates from Hamadan, were discovered on the north side of the palace of Darius I at Persepolis by the German architect Dr. Kraefter, who was working with Herzfeld, during the absence of the latter from Persepolis in 1932 (?), and on his own initiative. A new inscription of Xerxes of religious import was also discovered at Persepolis in the same year; see the articles of E. Herzfeld and E. Benveniste. Again, the Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the Kaiser Friedrichs Museum, Berlin, had acquired in 1930, indirectly from Herzfeld, a gold plate with an inscription of Ariaramnes; see Herzfeld's article on it in *Berlin Museum*, Bd. *52*, 1931, and in *Archäol. Mitt. Iran*, II, Berlin 1930. Prof. Schrader has declared this plate a fake of the Achaemenian period, dating at the earliest of the time of Artaxerxes II Mnemon. The reference to his article has escaped my notice.

Among grammars of the Ancient Persian language, I may mention A. Meillet, Grammaire du Vieux Perse, Paris 1915,

whose second and revised edition is the work of E. Benveniste. It is worth noting that the metrical form of some of the Ancient Persian inscriptions has been noticed first by Johannes Friedrich, *Orientalische Litteratur-Zeitung*, 1928, cols. 238-245 and 288 seq.

Nearly thirty thousand clay tablets with cuneiform inscriptions were discovered several years ago at Persepolis by the American Mission working under the direction of E. Herzfeld. They have been taken to America for the purpose of firing in electric ovens before their study. Besides certain suggestions made by Herzfeld as to the religious character of the contents of some of them and as to their composition in Ancient Persian cuneiform script, some even in Aramaic script, nothing definite has transpired up to date about these tablets.

Aramaic was widely spread in Western Asia during the Achaemenian epoch. If it was not the language of the chancellory of the Great Kings, it is certain that it was widely employed in commerce. Thus the Aramaic papyri, discovered in the excavations of the German mission in the island of Elephantine and at Assouan in Egypt, and the ostraca with Aramaic inscriptions found there by Clermont-Ganneau, both pertaining to the archives of a Jewish colony of the Achaemenian period, deserve our attention. They are published by Ed. Sachau in Leipzig in 1911 and by A. Cowley in Oxford in 1923. In L'Aramaico antico, Roma 1934, J. Messina criticises the theory of Schraeder that Darius had introduced Aramaic as the only language of the chancellory of the whole of the Persian Empire; see Iranische Beitträge I, *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 6. Jahrg., 5. Heft, 1930.

Greek inscriptions of the Parthian period have been published by Wilhelm Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, Leipzig 1903, Vol. I, and by Franz Cumont, particularly those found at Susa; for the latter see *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris 1932 et 1933. and *Mém. Miss.*, Vol. XX, 1928, pp. 77–98.

As regards Sassanian inscriptions in Pahlavi, the most important are those found at Paikuli. According to Herzfeld, Prof. F C. Andreas had deciphered and translated them as early as in 1914, but he had not published his results. Now they are accessible in E. Herzfeld, Paikuli, Monument and Inscriptions of the Early History of the Sassanian Empire. 2 Vols., Berlin 1924. Another big inscription was discovered at Naqshe-Rustam on the east side of the monu-

ment called *Kaabe-Zardusht* by Erich Schmidt in summer 1936. It has been published in transliteration and translation by M. Sprengling in *American Journal for Semitic Languages and Literature, 53*, No. 2, January 1937, pp. 126–144. It is dated about 293 A. D., i. e. the beginning of the reign of Narse. It is important for early Sassanian onomastics and for a reference to some obscure religious ceremony. E. A. Pachomoff has published the Pahlavi inscription of Derbend in Russian Azerbeijan, which has been translated by H. S. Nyberg in *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique d'Azerbeijan*, No. 8, Bakou 1929. It mentions among others a *Hamārakār* or Controller of Revenue of Azerbeijan. In excavations of the French Mission at Shahpur a bilingual (Arsacid and Sassanian) Pahlavi inscription, mentioning the foundation of a fire-temple called *Ātur-Anāhit*, was discovered in 1936. It has been published in *Revue des Arts Asiatiques*, X, 1936, by R. Ghirshman. Besides these monumental inscriptions, short Pahlavi inscriptions are found on engraved gems and coins. Those on gems have been published by Paul Horn and M. S. Ščekin. Since 1934 I have been collecting materials for a work on Sassanian seals preserved in different museums of Europe and America, and in private collections. Colonel Allotte de La Fuÿe has published in *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 22, 1925, pp. 107–111, fragments of vases with Pahlavi inscriptions acquired in Teheran. Similar fragments have been discovered at Susa. These inscriptions have only an epigraphical interest, as they are hopelessly fragmentary. The reprint of Smirnoff, Argenterie Sassanide, in 1935 revives our interest in Pahlavi inscriptions engraved on silver bowls, plates and jugs, preserved in the Hermitage Museum of Leningrad, all of which have not yet been studied. E. Herzfeld has published the readings of some in *Archäol. Mitt. Iran.* Finally, A. Pagliaro, The Pehlevi Dipinti, Report of the Sixth Season of Excavations at Dura-Europos, Chicago 1936, is worth mentioning. These dipinti were found on fresco-paintings in the ancient synagogue of Dura-Europos situated on the Euphratis. Neither the readings of A. Pagliaro nor those of E. Benveniste, to whom they had been communicated, are satisfactory.

It is again Christian Bartholomae who has left an immortal name in the field of Middle Persian or Pahlavi. His researches on the Pahlavi version of the Avesta scriptures are embodied in the foot-notes to Avesta words in his Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg 1904. He has also handled nearly the whole of the Pahlavi literature in quite a novel way. In philological discussions on

several obscure Pahlavi words, he has quoted passages *in extenso* in which they occur, with their readings and translations. By this method he could detect many incongruities in translations of some Iranists like Dastur Darab Sanjana and L. H. Mills. His series of articles entitled Mitteliranische Studien, I–VI, contributed to *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, and Zur Kenntnis der mitteliranischen Mundarten, I–VI, which appeared in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften* from 1916 to 1925, contain the results of years of continuous study in the field of Pahlavi literature. But his articles on Sassanian law, based on the *Mātīkān i Hazār Dātistān*, entitled Über ein Sassanidisches Rechtsbuch and Zum Sassanidischen Recht, I–V, which appeared in *S. Heidelberger A. W.* in 1910 and 1918–1923, show his masterly treatment of such a difficult subject as Sasssanian law. It must be noted that Bartholomae has given at the end of every article a list of Pahlavi passages translated therein, and thus he has greatly facilitated the work of students of Pahlavi. If any scholar of Iranian literature had really deserved the honour of a Memorial Volume from the Parsis, it was Prof. Christian Bartholomae. But as his writings are in German, of which the majority of the Parsis are ignorant, his services to the Iranian, rather to the Zoroastrian literature, remain unknown to the Parsis. The above-mentioned Pahlavi text has been translated by Sorab J. Bulsara with copious notes under the title The Law of the Ancient Persians, Bombay 1937. That he has not always agreed with Bartholomae in the interpretation of many passages, shows clearly the difficulty of the task which is enhanced by the ambiguity of the Pahlavi script. Bulsara has also translated another important Pahlavi text called Aērpatastān and Nīrangastān, Bombay 1915. This is the only text on Zoroastrian liturgy. Tahmuras D. Anklesaria and Sheriarji D. Bharucha had translated the Pahlavi text of Dātistān i Dēnīk into Gujarati about three decades ago. This translation has been published by Hoshang T. Anklesaria, Bombay 1926. Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana has published the remaining five volumes of his Dīnkard Series, vols. XV–XIX, during the years 1916–1928.

Among the minor Pahlavi texts, Shatroīhā i Īrān has been published in Italian by Markwart-Messina with translation and commentary in *Analecta Orientalia, 3*, Roma 1931. Among those who have published and translated some of the bigger texts contained in the Pahlavi Texts, I–II, edited by Jamasp-Asa, I may mention A. Pagliaro, J. C. Tavadia, J. C. Tarapore, B. N. Dhabhar, and J.

M. Unvala. These texts are simple but important for compiling a Pahlavi dictionary; particularly the texts of *King Husrav and His Boy* and *Draxt i Asūrīk* contain words which are seldom found elsewhere in the Pahlavi literature. The Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet Funds and Properties have published in recent years critical editions of some Pahlavi texts with their translations. They have entrusted the compilation of a Pahlavi dictionary to Bomanji N. Dhabhar, a renowned Iranian scholar. This work is far advanced. Jamshedji M. Unvala, Collection of Colophons of Manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism in some Libraries of Europe, Bombay 1940, contains among others several Pahlavi colophons of valuable manuscripts. They have been reproduced with transcriptions and translations. J. C. Katrak, Oriental Treasures, Bombay 1941, deals with colophons of manuscripts in private libraries of some Parsis of the Gujarate. This book records only the salient facts mentioned in these colophons.

It is worth noting that H. W. Bailey, E. Benveniste, A. Christensen, and W. Henning have dealt with the question of versification in some portions of the Pahlavi literature. It is not surprising that some sort of poetical compositions existed in Sassanian times, but their traces are certainly obscured by the ambiguity of the Pahlavi script and by the pendantry, and to certain extent, ignorance of the later scribes.

As regards the Pahlavi texts, the University of Copenhagen has published up to date in facsimile the following Pahlavi codices pertaining to its library, with an introduction by Arthur Christensen: K 20 and K 20b, containing *Artāk Vīrāz Nāmak*, *Bundahišn*, and other texts, K 35, containing *Dātestān i Dēnīk and Pahlavi Rivāyats* I–II, Epistles of Mānuščihr and the Selections from Zātsparm, and K 26, containing *Artāk Vīrāz Nāmak* and *Mātīkān i Yavišt Friyān.*

The manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts, discovered in Chinese Turkistan, are written in Middle Persian, Tokharian, Üigur, Chinese, Saka, Khotanic, Sanskrit and Pali languages, and in different scripts. They appertain to Manichaeism, Buddhism and Christianity. They are preserved in the University Library of Berlin, in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, in the British Museum of London, and in the Library of the University of Leningrad. The Middle Persian Fragments have been published by eminent scholars like F. C. Andreas, A. von Le Coq, A. Cowley, F. W. K. Müller, Paul Pelliot, Hans Reichelt and Carl Salemann. Turfan fragments

appertaining to Manichaeism and published by F. W. K. Müller, are written in two important dialects, in the Arsacid or north-western dialect and in the south-western dialect, spoken in Persis, which became the official language of the Sassanian Empire. The importance of the Turfan texts lies in the fact that the ideograms employed in the Pahlavi of inscriptions and books pertaining to Zoroastrianism are wholly eliminated from it, and that they preserve therefore faithfully the pronunciations of Pahlavi of the third century A. D. Bartholomae has called the Pahlavi of these texts Turfan Pahlavi. Again, among the fragments published by Müller, there are some written in Sogdian, a north-eastern dialect of Pahlavi which flourished approximately from the first century of the Christian era upto the invasion of the Mongols, perhaps still later, in the regions of Samarqand and Farghana, with Samarqand as its centre. The characters employed for the Turfan documents are Estrangelo-Syriac with certain modifications, whereas the Sogdian ones were written also in Estrangelo-Syriac and in Sogdian characters, which were of Aramaic origin. In the latter the long Buddhist texts discovered in the grotto of Touen-Houang by A. Stein and Paul Pelliot are written. Robert Gauthiot who had deciphered the Sogdian fragments brought to Paris by Pelliot's mission as early as in 1911 and 1912 wrote his Essai de Grammaire Sogdienne, I, Phonétique, Paris 1914 It has been published as a posthumous work by A. Meillet in 1923. Its II. Partie. Morphologie, Syntaxe et Glossaire — Paris 1929 is the work of E. Benveniste.

Ellis H. Minns has published in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. XXXV, 1915, Parchments of the Parthian Period from Avroman in Kurdistan, discovered in 1909. Two of these parchments are written in Greek, and the third in Pahlavi. The script of the latter is Aramaic. Besides a summary note on it by Minns, it has been published by A. Cowley in *J. R. A. S.*, April 1919, pp. 1 seq., and by H. S. Nyberg in *Le Monde Oriental*, XVII, 1923, pp. 182–230. I have tried to give some definite meanings to words, and readings to proper names occurring in the Pahlavi document, following therein the readings of Cowley, in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 1920. It is dated month Harvatat of the year 300 of the Parthian (Arsacid) era, which began on the 10th October 246 B. C., and hence the parchment must have been written in 54 A. D. This is the oldest document written in Pahlavi, and particularly in the Parthian or north-western dialect, discovered up to date.

There exists a big collection of Pahlavi papyri in the Staatlichen Museen in Berlin and Vienna. Olaf Hansen has published a few papyri of Berlin in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, No. 9, 1938. Their script is Book-Pahlavi, but very cursive, which makes their decipherment extremely difficult.

Finally, I may mention H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch des Pahlavi, in two parts, Uppsala 1928–1931, which gives selected Pahlavi texts and a glossary. H. S. Nyberg has explained in *Le Monde Oriental*, XVII, 1923, Semitic verbs in Pahlavi and their forms which we know as ideograms.

Firuz S. Masani's Series of Pāzand Prayers, Bombay 1917–1921, is an important contribution to the understanding of Pazand, i. e. Pahlavi written in Avesta characters, reproducing the Middle Iranian or non-Semitic pronunciations with a marked tendency for the southern dialect. Masani gives the texts in Gujarati characters and their Gujarati translations. This is the first succinct translation of the Pazand texts made by a Parsi scholar after the publication of Spiegel's translation in Avesta, die Heiligen Schriften der Parsen, übersetzt, Bd. III, Leipzig 1863.

Sheriarj D. Bharucha has edited for the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet Funds and Properties the Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsis in six parts, Bombay 1906–1933. The collection contains the Sanskrit versions of several Avesta and Pahlavi texts. Part IV has also an old Gujarati version of *Škand Vimānīk Vīčār*

What concerns the Persian language and literature, I may mention also books referring to the history and geography of Iran written in Arabic, and their translations in European langauges. Among Persian grammars, Hans Jensen, Neupersische Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung der historischen Entwicklung, Heidelberg 1931, is an important work from philological standpoint. St. Clair-Tisdall, Modern Persian Conversation Grammar, Julius Gross Verlag, Heidelberg 1923, and A. Seidel, Praktische Grammatik der Neupersischen Sprache für den Selbstunterricht, Hartleben Verlag, Leipzig, are two useful grammars for learning colloquial Persian without a teacher in comparatively short time. Scholars like A. Christensen, G. Grierson, Cl. Huart, Heinrich Junker, Lenz, Lorimer, Oskar Mann, W. Miller, J. de Morgan and Morgenstierne have contributed greatly to the knowledge of various dialects spoken in modern Iran. Among these dialects Kurdish and Ossetish can be reckoned as separate langugaes. A. Christensen has published

popular tales and other texts in some northern dialects with translation and vocabulary in the Reports of the Royal Danish Society. H. F. J. Junker, Yaghnobi- Studien, Leipzig 1930, W. Miller, Beiträge zur ossetischen Etymologie, *Indogermanische Forschungen, 21*, pp. 323–334, and Miller and Freiman, Ossetisch-Russisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, Leningrad 1927, 1929 and 1934, are useful, the former for the study of Sogdian of which Yaghnobi can be called a modern survivor, the latter two for certain peculiarities which point to its relationship with the language of the ancient Scythes inhabiting the regions of the Black Sea. In a series of articles, entitled Beiträge zur neu-persischen Lexicographie, contributed to *W.Z.K.M., 15, 17*, and *18*, R. von Stackelberg has explained, among others, many Pahlavi words occurring in the Pahlavi texts *Ayātkār i Zarērān* and *Husrav i Kavātān u rētak ē* from their Modern Persian equivalents. On the occasion of the Firdosi's Millenary in 1935, the German Government presented to His Imperial Majesty Reza Shah Pahlavi the master-work of Fritz Wolff, Glossar zum Firdosis Schahname, Berlin 1935, and Supplement-Band, Verskonkordanz der Schahname-Ausgabe von Macan, Mohl und Vullers, Berlin 1935. This is the only complete glossary of the Shāhnāma ever published. My translation of chapters VI and VII of Al-Khwārazmī, Liber Mafātīḥ al-'Olūm, edited by G. Van Vloten, Leyden 1895, deals with Persian words used by Arab historians in their works. Similarly, Gabriel Ferrand has discovered Persian elements in Arabic texts on navigation of the XVth and XVIth centuries, *Journal Asiatique*, Avril–Juin 1924, pp. 193–257. What a fund of information for those who want to free the Modern Persian language of Arabic elements! S. Haim, New English–Persian Dictionary, 2 vols., Teheran 1930, and Dr. Said Nafisi, Dictionnaire Persan–Français, 2 vols., Téhéran 1936, are two reliable dictionaries written by Iranians themselves. The latter is very commendable.

Ibn al-Balkhī, Farsnamāh or the History of Fars is edited by Le Strange and Nicholson in *Gibb Memorial Series*, New Series I, London 1921 In Šakarastān, I, (in Persian), Teheran 1308 (new style) Zahīrul-Islāmzādeh gives a concise history of Khuzistan from protohistoric times up to the downfall of the Sassanian Empire. For the early history of this province he relies on the reports of the French Archaeological Mission of Susiana.

For those who are interested in 'Omar Khayyām, A Christensen's Critical Studies in his *Rubā'iyāt* with the revised text and an English translation, Copenhagen 1927, would be welcome.

H. Kazemzadeh, Les Chiffres siyāk et la comptabilité persane, Paris 1915, is a very important contribution for understanding the system of book-keeping still employed in Iran. Similar system is traceable in Pahlavi figures and in English weights and measures.

Among catalogues, Chr. Bartholomae, Die Zendhandschriften der K. Hof-und Staatsbibliothek in München...Beschrieben, München 1915, is besides being an exemplary descriptive catalogue, a monumental work on Zoroastrian palaeography. Bomanji N. Dhabhar has prepared Descriptive Catalogue of some Manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism in the Mulla Feroze Library, Bombay 1923, and Descriptive Catalogue of All Manuscripts in the First Dastur Meherji Rana Library, Navsari - Bombay 1923.

V. Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol Invasion, *Gibb Mem. Ser.*, N. S., V, London 1928, contains a mass of historical and geographical materials about a part of Iran. John Cadman, A Journey through the Bakhtiary Country, published in the *Naft*, vol. II, No 5, Sept. 1926, pp. 3-13, gives a fresh picture of the Bakhtiary country after the discovery of its oil-fields. The *A. P. O. C. Magazine* contains among typical business and sport news of the Anglo-Persian (now Iranian) Oil Company sporadic articles of archaeological interest, e. g. The Beauties of Persia by Arnold T. Wilson, see Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 27-30, in which he describes his journey in Khuzistan, particularly to Ahwaz and Shushter. Arthur Christensen who visited Iran several times in recent years gives a good description of ancient and modern Iran in Det gamle og det nye Persian, Köbenhavn 1930. A good pictorial idea of modern Iran of the epoch of His Imperial Majesty Reza Shah Pahlavi has been given by von Graefe in a magnificent album of photographs of modern cities of Iran, accompanied by a short text, published in Berlin in 1936.

Paul Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, nach den arabischen Geographen, 7 vols., is a very important contribution to the political geography of Iran in the middle ages. E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, IV, contains a valuable article of geographical and historical interest on Sakastana or Seistan, which has been followed by Aurel Stein, The Indo-Iranian Borderlands - their prehistory in the light of geography and recent excavations.

George G. Cameron, History of Early Iran, Chicago 1936, deals with the beginning of the history of the kings of Awan who reigned at Susa about 2670 B. C. up to the rise of the Achaemenian empire. For the history of Elam he has utilised the Elamite historical inscriptions and tablets discovered at Susa and published by V. Scheil in several volumes of the *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, later *Mém. Miss.*, and in the *Rev. d'Assyr.*

G. Hüsing, Vorgeschichte und Wanderung der Parsava, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft zu Wien*, XL, Wien 1930, is an important work on the history of the Persians who founded later on the empire of the Achaemenids under Cyrus. Finally, I may mention J. Hertel, Achämeniden und Kayaniden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Irans, Leipzig 1924, in which the author identifies Kavi Vishtāspa, the patron of Zarathushtra with Hystaspes, father of Darius the Great.

Arthur Christensen, L'Empire des Sassanides, le peuple, l'état, la cour, published in the *Reports of the Royal Danish Society*, Copenhague 1907, and its revised and enlarged second edition, entitled L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhague 1936, give the political, social and cultural history of Iran under the Sassanian rule. H. Cordier has treated the relations of Yazdagard III and his son Peroz with China in Histoire générale de la Chine et de ses relation avec les pays étrangers, Paris 1920, tome I, pp. 436–438.

Immediately after the fall of the Sassanian empire, the princes of Tabaristan and of the adjoining mountainous districts declared their independence, and ruled over these provinces for nearly 150 years, sometimes only formally acknowledging the suzerainty of the Caliphs of Bagdad. A short sketch of the History of the Ispahbads of Ṭabaristān and of the Masmoghāns of Damavand has been given by me in Coins of Ṭabaristan, Paris 1938, pp. 27–38. The same subject has been treated by M. Rabino in Les Dynasties du Mazandaran de l'an 50 avant l'hégire à l'an 1006 de l'hégire (572 à 1597/98 A. D.) d'après les chroniques locales, *JA*. 1936, pp. 397–474, and by R. Vasmer, Die Eroberung Tabaristans durch die Araber zur Zeit des Chalif al-Manṣūr, Leningrad 1927. V. Minorsky has published several articles in *L'Encyclopédie de l'Islam* on the early history of Muhammadan Iran, one of which La domination des Dailamites has appeared in the *Publications de la Société des Études Iraniennes*, No. 3. Two pamphlets published by the Hoyboon or the Supreme Council of the Kurdish Government, one entitled The case

of Kurdistan against Turkey by Prince Sureya Bedr Khan, Philadelphia 1928, and the other La question kurde, ses origines et ses causes by Dr. Bletch Chirguh, Le Caire 1930, throw a curious light on the post-war politics of the great European powers regarding the Kurdish minority, residing in the Turkish province of Kurdistan, bordering on Iran.

Arthur Christensen has tried to trace the Iranian legendary history as given in the Shāhnāma to the original Pahlavi *Xvatāi Nāmak* in a series of monographs published in *Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforkning*, Köbenhavn. The titles of the monographs are the following: Rustam og Sohrab; Firdusi: Beschen og Manische, en Episode af Schahname; Smeden Kavāh og det gamle persiske Riksbanner; and Romanen om Bahram Tschobin, et Rekonstruktionsforsög. I may mention also his Recherches sur l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens, Stockholm 1918. The Shāhnāma has been translated into German by Friedrich Rückert and into English by A. G. Warner and E. Warner, in 9 volumes, London 1905–1925. As said above, the credit of compiling a complete dictionary of the Shāhnāma and a concordance of the verses of the Shāhnāma, as published in the editions of Macan, Mohl and Vullers, goes to Fritz Wolff. This work was published in Berlin in 1936, and a copy of it printed on special paper and richly bound was presented to His Imperial Majesty Reza Shah Pahlavi on the occasion of the Firdusi Millenary by the German Minister in Teheran.

The complete Shāhnāma, in ten volumes, in Gujarati transcription with a Gujarati literal translation has been published by Mahiar N. Kutar and Farzamurz N. Kutar, Bombay 1914–1918. It is regrettable that although the published text is the result of immense labour, spent in collating several manuscripts and editions of the Shāhnāma, the authors have not given the variants. This is the first Parsi attempt at translation of the complete Shāhnāma.

What concerns ethnology and ethnography of Iran, M. N. Dhalla, Zoroastrian Civilisation from the earlist times to the downfall of the last Zoroastrian Empire 651 A. D., New York 1922, can be aptly cosidered a supplement to Wilhelm Geiger, Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum. E. Herzfeld, Völker and Kulturzusammenhänge im Alten Orient, Berlin 1928, and G. Hüsing, Völkerschichten in Iran, *Mitt. Anthrop. Ges.* Wien, *46,* 1916, are of pure ethnological interest. A. Christensen has compared some Iranian legends with those of other peoples in several articles published in Danish periodicals. Another interesting study is that of Edward Noel, The

Character of the Kurds as illustrated by their Proverbs and Sayings, *B. S. O. S.*, 1920, I, iv, pp. 79–80.

M. M. Murzban has published in Bombay an English translation of Mlle. D. Menant, Les Parsis : histoire des communautés zoroastriennes de l'Inde, Paris 1898. P. Molesworth Sykes, The Parsis of Persia, *Journal of the Society of Arts, 54*, pp. 754–767, is another contribution to the subject. Raymond Schwab, Vie d'Anquetil Duperron, suivie des usages civils et religieux des Parses par A. Duperron, avec deux essais du Dr. Sir J. J. Modi, Paris 1934 has, been published under the patronage of the Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet. Its importance lies in Anquetil's description of the civil and religious customs of the Parsis of Surat in the latter half of the eighteenth century. I had written in 1918 at the request of Prof. Bartholomae a monograph in German, entitled Die religiösen und socialen Sitten und Gebräuche der Parsen, an excerpt form which has been published in *Svenska Orientsälskapets Årsbok*, Stockholm 1924, pp. 168–190. I have embodied in it several customs which are not mentioned in Dr. Modi's Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsis, Bombay 1922. I do not know the fate of the original copy of my monograph which I had given in 1936 to Prof. Hermann Güntert of Heidelberg for publication.

Dr. Modi has contributed in Anthropological Papers, IV, and Asiatic Papers, IV, several papers on Iranian legends and allied subjects compared with similar legends among other peoples.

I have included in this survey books and articles on religions which have been influenced more or less by Zoroastrianism, and which have in a certain measure exercised an influence on the political history of Iran. I need not go into details on this question of influence. I intend here to point out some interesting books and articles on the subject. E. Blochet, Christianisme et Mazdéisme chez les Turks-Orientaux, *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien.* 3e sér., tome VII, Nos. 1–2, pp. 31–125, Paris 1929–1930, is full of information on the religion of the Turks before they adopted Islam. H. Gressmann, Die Umwandelung der orientalischen Religionen unter dem Einfluss hellenischen Geistes, 1916, explains the syncretic tendency which is perceived, among others, in the religion of the Parthians. The Hellenic influence penetrated in the Orient with the Macedonian conquest. In Salmān Pāk et les premices spirituelles de l'Islam iranien, *Publ. Soc. Étud. Iran.*, No. 7, Paris 1934, Louis Massignon has exploded the theory that Salmān Pāk the Fārisī was the same as Dastūr Dīnyār. He was as an Iranian only a legitimist upholding the

claim of the Aliïdes to the caliphate. I. Scheftelowitz, Die altpersische Religion in ihrer Beziehung zum Judentum, Giessen 1920, shows the influence which Zoroastrianism exercised on exilic Judaism. The same subject has been treated by Alfred Bertholet and Nathan Söderblom. Mrs. Drower has recently published a book on the Mandaeans and Mandaeism or the religion of the so-called Christians of St. John, in which the authoress has devoted a chapter on the similarities of certain Mandaean and Zoroastrian rites and ceremonies, and hinted at the probable borrowings from later Zoroastrianism. In 1933 seven manuscripts appertaining to Manichaeism were discovered at Medinet Mahdi in the province of Fayum in Egypt. These manuscripts, more or less fragmentary, contain the Coptic version of the works composed by Mani and his disciples. One of them has the major portion of the Book called Kephalaïa which was composed by Mani himself. They are dated at the latest 400 A. D. They appertained to the library of a Manichaean. Franz Cumont has published a short article on this discovery in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CVII, 1933. I have published a short note in Gujarati, based on Cumont's article in the *Kaiser-i-Hind* of the 1st October 1933, pp. 46–47. Some portions of these manuscripts have been published with their translation into German by Carl Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky in *S. Preuss. A.W.* 1933. These Manichaean documents contain undoubtedly references to Zoroastrian doctrines, though from a biased point of view of a Manichaean, and therefore they are important for understanding Zoroastrianism as it was professed by early Sassanian sovereigns. Arthur Christensen, Le reign du roi Kavadh I et le communisme mazdakite, published in the *Reports of the Royal Danish Society*, IX. 6, and O. G. von Wesendonck, Die Mazdakite. Eine kommunistisch-religiöse Bewegung im Sassanidenreich, *Der Neue Orient*, Bd. 6, Heft I, Berlin 1919 are two best books on Mazdakism which had threatened the very foundations of the Sassanian empire and of the Sassanian society. It would not be out of place to note that Soviet Iranists are trying their level best to rehabilitate Mazdak and his communistic teachings, saying that Mazdak aimed only at breaking the pride of the Sassanian feudal aristocracy. The Mazdaznan movement of Otoman Zar-Adusht Ha'nish has recently found a footing among the Parsis of Bombay. The Mazdaznan philosophy, whose basis is undoubtedly Christian, lays a particular stress on the Hindu practice of Prāṇa Yoga – *prāṇa* and *apāna* or breathing in and breathing out – as applied to some Zoroastrian prayers, particularly to the *Ashem Vōhū* and *Yathā Ahū*

Vairyō prayers; moreover it advocates the practice of vegetarian diet. This is amply shown by the Mazdaznan pamphlets, published in Europe and by *Mazdaznan India*, published in Bombay since 1941. Raffaele Pettazzoni speaks of the mysteries of Mithra in Ch. V of his I Misteri – Saggiò di una teoria storico-religiosa, Bologna 1924. I have published a translation of this chapter in the *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, No. 20, Bombay 1932, pp. 151–206, under the title Persian Mysteries. In Mithra, Zoroastre, et la préhistoire aryenne du Christianisme, Paris 1935, Ch. Autran has taken into consideration the Mitanni tablets from Boghazköi, mentioning the Aryan gods Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra and Nāsatyas. He comes to the conclusion that Judeo-Christianism has accepted the religion of salvation in which Christ, like Mithra, becomes the Saviour. Mithra figures for the first time with Ahura Mazda and Anāhita in the inscription of Artaxerxes II Mnemon. His cult was spread in Asia Minor during the time of the Zoroastrian diaspora. There is no doubt that the Parthians practised Mithraism and venerated Anāhita-Anaitis as his paredre. This is proved from numismatic evidence. The Cilician pirates captured by Pompei in 67 B. C. were responsible for the spread of the cult of Mithra among the Roman legions, and as Sol Invictus Mithra enjoyed later on the imperial favour. His cult was thus spread far and wide with the expansion of the Roman empire, as it is proved by numerous monuments. During the Sassanian period, besides being venerated as the Yazat presiding over the Sun, he enjoyed a special honour as the guardian of promise, and therefore we see him on the famous bas-relief of Tāq e Bōstān figurated with the radiated head, just as on Parthian coins of Mithridates I and some of his successors. He stands there as witness to the installation-scene of Ardashir II (379–384 A.D.) by Ohrmazd. This radiated figure of Mithra has been introduced among the Parsis since the early decades of the last century as the portrait of Zarathushtra. The Mithraic banquet with bread and wine as its basis appeared to the early Christians to be a diabolic counterfeiting of the Eucharist (Justin. *Apolog.* 1. 66; Tertullian, *De prescr. haeret.* 40, quoted by R. Pettazzoni, I Misteri, p. 269). G. Furlani, La religione dei Yezidi. Teste religiose dei Yezidi, Bologna 1931, is a well-documented work on the religious sect residing in Mt. Sinjar in the Mesopotamian district of Mosul, which is also known as that of the Devil-worshippers. In an English translation of this work (Bombay 1940) I have mentioned in additional notes and in an appendix several points of resemblance

of the Yezidi customs and beliefs with those of the Zoroastrians. Under the constant accusation of dualism by rival religions like Christianity, the Zarvanite sect sprang up among the Zoroastrians in the Sassanian epoch. It believed in the all supreme Zrvān or Time by whom Ōhrmazd and Ahrman, the good and evil spirits, were created. The Zarvanite tendency is discernible in the authors of some Pahlavi religious tracts. E. Benveniste, A. Christensen, and H. S. Nyberg have published articles on this subject. I may mention an article of A. Christensen, A-t-il existé une religion zurvanite ?, *MO. 25*, Uppsala 1931, pp. 29–34.

What concerns Zoroastrianism, E. Benveniste, C. Clemen, Fr. Windischmann and L. H. Gray have treated the question of the Persian religion according to Greek and Latin classics.

As to the date of Zarathushtra, Chr. Bartholomae in Zarathushtras Leben und Lehre, Heidelberg 1919, p. 10, would not admit a date later than 900 B. C., whereas A. V. W. Jackson in Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran, New York 1899, pronounces the traditional date, 600 B. C., to be the correct one. A. Meillet in Trois Conférences sur les Gathas de l'Avesta, *Annales du Musée Guimet*, *Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation*, *44*, Paris 1925, p. 22 and 32, considers the traditional date probable, if we take into consideration linguistic, economic and political data. E. Herzfeld and Lehmann-Haupt are also in favour of the traditional date, but they give it as 570 and 550 B. C. respectively, see *Pavry Or. Stud.*, London 1933, p. 137 and p. 255. Dastur Dr. Dhalla pronounces on the date of Zarathushtra in Zoroastrian Theology, New York 1914, p. 11, as follows : " Zarathushtra planted his new faith in Iran at a date approximating 1000 B. C., though some learned scholars, basing their arguments on traditional sources, are inclined to assign a date as late as the seventh century B. C., or, to be more exact, 660–583 B. C."

For the study of Zoroastrianism the following works must be consulted : Chr. Bartholomae, Zarathushtras Leben und Lehre, Heidelberg 1919 ; A. Meillet, Trois conférences sur les Gathas de Zarathushtra, Paris 1925 ; M. N. Dhalla, Zoroastrian Theology, New York 1914, and History of Zoroastrianism, New York 1918 ; and R. Pettazzoni, La religione di Zarathustra nella storia religiosa dell' Iran, Bologna 1930. Both Dhalla and Pettazzoni have given the history of Zoroastrianism from its very beginning down to the modern times. Pettazzoni has treated the subject exhaustively, availing himself of all sources of information which he has quoted

in the notes. A. Christensen has contributed monographs on the critical study of Zoroastrianism, entitled Études sur le Zoroastrisme de la perse antique, Köbenhavn 1928, Quelques notices sur les plus anciennes périodes du Zoroastrisme, *Ex Actorum Orientalium*, IV, p. 81 seq., and Les gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique, Paris 1936. J. M. Unvala, Observations on the Religion of the Parthians, Bombay 1925, is the only attempt made up to date at tracing the religious beliefs and customs of the Parthians from historical, epigraphic and numismatic sources. Archaeological and numismatic documents discovered recently at Susa show that they practised two main cults, those of Mithra and Anaïtis. On the cult of Anāhita-Anaïtis in Susiana cf. Allotte de La Fuÿe, Sur le culte d'Anaïtis en Susiane, *Mém. Déleg.* VIII, and Fr. Cumont, Note sur le culte d'Anaïtis, *Revue Archéologique*, 1905, *5*, p. 25 seq. Anāhita enjoyed a special cult even among the Sassanians. A fire-temple called Ātur-Anāhit was built at Shahpur in the reign of Shahpur I. Anāhita figures on the reverse of certain coins of Bahram II on the right of the fire-altar, and on the left of the seated figure of Chosroes II in the bas-relief of the great arch of Tāq e Bōstān.

Eminent Iranists have contributed articles on various rites and ceremonies, and on customs and beliefs of the Zoroastrians in *Rev. de l'Hist. des Rel.*, in *Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics*, and in other encyclopaedias.

The injunctions of the Rivāyats have played an important part in the religious life of the Parsis up to very recently. These Rivāyats, composed in Persian, are the collections of questions on religious subjects asked by the Zoroastrians of India to their co-religionists in Iran through their emissaries and answers brought by them during the course of the XVth upto the beginning of the XVIIIth centuries of the Christian era. Maneckji Rustamji Unvala had prepared an edition of the Rivāyat of Dārāb Hormazyār in, two volumes, which has been published after his death by Dr. Sir Jivanji J. Modi with an introduction, in Bombay in 1922. Bomanji N. Dhabhar has published an English translation of the Rivāyat of Hormaziār Farāmarz with copious notes and a glossary of unusual Persian words found only in Zoroastrian writings, Bombay 1932.

There is a big literature on Zoroastrianism written by the Parsis in Gujarati, of which the following are worth mentioning: Jivanji J. Modi, Lectures and sermons on Zoroastrianism; Khurshedji E. Pavri, Resālehāe Khorshed, which has been translated into English; Sheriarji D. Bharucha, Rīstistān or a description of

funeral ceremonies of the Parsis. Among works on the same subject written in English I may mention the following : Sorabji N. Kanga, Heaven and Hell and their location in Zoroastrianism ; Heaven and Hell and their location in Plato ; The Law of Suggestion and Self-Suggestion in the Ardibehesht Yasht in the light of Modern Spiritualism ; J. M. Chatterji, The ethical conception of the Gathas, Navsari 1922 ; Rustamji E. Sanjana, The Parsee Book of Books ; The Zend Avesta and Spiritualism through Zoroastrian eyes.

Behramshah N. Shroff founded the mystical movement of the Ilme-Khshnum in the first decade of this century, one of whose modern exponents is Dr. Faramroz Chinivala. They have published several books in Gujarati. Their chief organ is Frashogard, to which articles in Gujarati and English are contributed. Cherāg, edited by Ardeshar N. Bilimoria, is the organ of the Parsi theoso- phists.

Two important works on the early history of the Parsis have been published in Bombay in 1920 ; one is Studies in Parsi History by Shahpurshah H. Hodivala and the other is Parsis of Ancient India by Shapurji K. Hodivala.

Many interesting articles and monographs on Iranian and allied subjects have been published in the *Journal of the Iranian Association* which has ceased its publication since 1924, and in the *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, in which also articles on Iranian subjects written in foreign languages are made accessible in English translations to Parsi and other scholars. Again, Indian, European and American scholars have made valuable contributions to Iranian studies in *Hoshang Memorial Volume*, Bombay 1918, in *Indo-Iranian Studies*, Bombay 1925, in *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume*, Bombay 1930 and in *Jehangirji Vimadalal Memorial Volume* (in Gujarati) Bombay 1937. Further, two other Memorial volumes are in preparation, one in honour of Prof. A. V. W. Jackson, and the other in honour of Dinshaw J. Irani.

The Society for the Promotion of Researches into Zoroastrian Religion, the Rāhnumāe Māzdayasnān Sabhā, and the Gāthā Society are doing good research-work in the field of Zoroastrianism since several decades. They have published a few volumes of their proceedings.

What concerns archaeology, it is important to note that Iran and adjoining countries, especially Mesopotamia, Syria, Central Asia, Afghanistan and Baluchistan were interrelated in ancient times, as regards their civilisations. The main problem which archaeological missions of France, Germany, America, Sweden and

England (rather of the Indian Government) sought to solve in recent years was that of the civilisation of the painted pottery of the type of Susa I. Such pottery was discovered from Egypt in the west to China (Pekin) in the east and from Central Asia (Anau) in the north to Sind in the south. The approximate date when this civilisation flourished can be given as 3500 to 4000 B. C. In Susiana and Mesopotamia it preceded the local civilisations. Moreover, the discovery of copper and obsidian with this pottery at Susa proved the existence of commercial relations of this ancient city with countries lying as far north as the Caucasus and Southern Russia. R. de Mecquenem has given an annual survey of excavations on prehistoric sites in Western Asia during the last decade in several issues of *L'Anthropologie* of Paris. Among European nations the French and the Germans have carried on for years extensive excavations at different places simultaneously.

The method followed by archaeological missions is to dig a trench of length and breadth, sufficient to arrive at important conclusions, in a mound on the surface of which archaeological remains are noticed. The trench opened on the top of such a mound is carried down to the natural soil. At Susa the depth of the trench of de Morgan had reached 25 metres. Again, of all ancient sites it was at Susa that in other trenches remnants of different epochs of the civilisation of this historic city were found, often in successive layers, dating as far back as 4000 B. C. down to the thirteenth century A. D., although sometimes one or more of the intermediate layers were found missing. Some archaeologists consider each layer as belonging to a city, thus e. g. they count seven cities of Troy, as if the first city was completely razed to the ground and on its ruins another city was built. It is preferable to speak in terms of epochs. Stratigraphical observations of a trench and the objects found in each layer form sure means of datation of similar objects from a newly explored archaeological site. I have already said above that archaeological missions have as their chief aim the study of a particular civilisation or the solution of a particular problem. But as they follow the method described above, they make incidentally other observations helpful to fellow-archaeologists.

Excavations in Iran, Mesopotamia and Syria have brought to light the civilisations of peoples vaguely mentioned in the Old Testament (Genesis, ch. XI), and those of the Achaemenians, Seleucids, Parthians, Sassanians and Arabs. Again, they have helped to determine the interrelation of these civilisations and their mutual

influences. The French Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan has discovered at Bamiyan Graeco-Buddhic remains in which Iranian influence was predominant; see A. Foucher, L'art gréco-boudhique du Gandhara, vols. I–II, Paris 1905–1918, and A. et Y. Godard et J. Hackin, Les antiquités bouddhiques de Bamiyan, *Mémoires de la Délégation en Afghanistan*, Paris-Bruxelles 1928. Important from Parsi standpoint are the excavations of the German Mission at Ctesiphon and at Seleucia on the Tigris, those of the French Mission at Shahpur and those of the joint Franco-American Mission at Doura-Europos. These missions discovered remains of the Parthian and Sassanian palaces and other relics of the civilisation of these epochs. Again, the German expedition of Le Coq at Turfan had succeeded in discovering manuscripts pertaining to Buddhism, Christianity and Manichaeism, written in a Pahlavi dialect, but in the Estrangelo-Syriac script, which I have mentioned above.

For oriental archaeology, G. Contenau, Manuel d'Archéologie Orientale, 3 vols, Paris 1927–1931, is the most useful work, written in a lucid style, but with great precision, and abundantly illustrated. The Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric times to the present, edited by A. U. Pope, E. Kühnel and H. H. F. Jayne, 3 vols, London 1934 is a work to which a number of archaeologists have contributed articles on nearly all questions of Iranian art and archaeology of different epochs of the Iranian civilisation, and which is abundantly illustrated with art photographs in black and white and in colours. Again, *Bulletin of the American Institute for Persian Art and Archaeology*, New York 1932, seq., edited by A. U. Pope contains among others a series of articles by Pope himself, mostly on Islamic art.

Now, as regards archaeology of Iran and the adjoining countries, the following books might be consulted: *Āthār e Irān-Annales du Service Archéologique de l'Iran*, Paris 1936 seq. This periodical contains, besides articles on Iranian art by eminent archaeologists, valuable articles by A. Godard on historic monuments of Muhammadan Iran, like mosques and khāns. E. Herzfeld, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, Berlin 1929 seq., contains discussions on questions pertaining to Iranian archaeology supported by the works of classical authors and Arab historians, and by references from Avesta and Pahlavi scriptures. It comprises also learned reports on some ancient Iranian monuments visited by Herzfeld and on excavations on certain old sites in Iran carried out by him. His Archaeological History of Iran, New York 1935, might interest the Parsis.

As to Susian art and archaeology, most of the pre-Achaemenian remains discovered at Susa have been described in *Mém Déleg.* and *Mém Miss.* Two objects discovered in 1933 in the layer dating between 3500 and 3200 B. C. deserve a short notice. They have been described by R. de Mecquenem in *Mém. Miss.* XXV. One is a cobble of irregular shape, 13 cm. × 21 cm., wholly covered with an inscription in an unknown cursive script, in which crosses, svastikas and *ankhs* are met with. The writing-materials were metallic ink and a reed-*kalam.* Many extravagant guesses about the script have been made. It is declared by some to be demotic, by others Pahlavi! The other object is a statuette carved in the round out of bitumen. It represents a sitting lion, having in its jaw the head of a man, who is sitting between its front legs in the Iranian fashion. It can be surely considered as the prototype of the Egyptian sphinx. It is undoubtedly a funeral monument, in which the lion would represent death devouring the man. Another outstanding discovery made in 1936 at Chogha Zambil, situated 40 miles to the south of Susa, by the French Mission of Susiana was that of a Ziqqurat or storeyed tower, similar to that of Babylon. The site has been identified as that of Dur-Undashi, the city which was founded by Untash-GAL, the Elamite king, in about 1500 B. C. It is the first Ziqqurat discovered in Iran and the biggest of all those found in Mesopotamia. It is built on a square plan, its sides measuring 103 metres, and its actual height being 25 metres. J. de Mecquenem has published a comparative study of this Ziqqurat in *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Paris 1937, pp. 201–206.

I have shown the survival of the Babylonian myths of Nin-Giszida and Enkidu in the later Iranian tradition preserved in the Pahlavi *Bundahišn* and the *Shāhnāma* in two articles entitled Zohāk published in *Studi e Materiali*, V, Bologna 1929, pp. 56–68, and Gōpatšāh, published in *B.S.O.S.*, V. iii, London 1929, pp. 505–506. Working on the same line, much light can be thrown on other Iranian myths.

As regards the Achaemenian archaeology, E. Herzfeld and after him Erich Schmidt have directed excavations at Persepolis for an American mission. They have brought to light many important monuments, among others a stair-case with a sculptured frieze in excellent preservation. I have already mentioned the discovery of gold and silver plates with a trilingual inscription of Darius I and of 30,000 clay-tablets pertaining to the Achaemenian period. E. Herzfeld had carried on excavations also at Pasargadae. He has

published his report on it in *Archäol. Mitt. Iran.*, I, pp. 4–16. R. de Mecquenem had drawn a plan of the palace of Darius I at Susa and that of the adjoining hall of columns which was rebuilt by Artaxerxes II long before 1914, when M. L. Pillet published Le Palais de Darius Ier à Suse. Ve siècle avant J. C. I have published an article on the same subject with my observations on the actual state of the ruins in *B.S.O.S.*, V. 1929, pp. 229–232, with the plan of R. de Mecquenem and two plates of the original photographs of the hall of columns taken in 1927. The trilingual inscription of Darius I concerning this palace, which I have mentioned above, had been discovered in its ruins in many copies of the three versions on stone and brick. This inscription is of great archaeological value.

Much remains still to be done in the field of archaeology of the Parthian period. Specialists have contributed articles on architecture, pottery, seals, jewellery etc. of the Parthian and Sassanian periods in A Survey of Persian Art. Still the attribution of certain objects, like vases and seals, definitely to the Parthian or to the Sassanian epochs remains doubtful.

As regards Sassanian archaeology, Sassanian palaces and other monuments are described in Fr. Sarre und E. Herzfeld, Iranische Felsreliefs, Berlin 1910. E. Herzfeld, Paikuli, etc., Berlin 1924, describes the ruins of a palace of the early Sassanian period in which abundant material of Pahlavi inscriptions was found. Another Sassanian palace was discovered at Damghan (Tepe Hissar), see Fiske Kimball's article in A Survey of Persian Art. The French excavations at Shahpur have freed a part of the palace of Shahpur I, with an adjoining fire-temple called Ātur-Anāhit. Several Sassanian buildings were excavated at Kish in Mesopotamia by L. C. Watelin. R. de Mecquenem could trace the plan of another Sassanian building at Susa. The latter had taken a pencil impression of a graffito discovered by him at Persepolis in 1928, which Allotte de La Fuÿe has declared to be the portrait of Shahpur, brother of Ardashir I; see *Rev. d'Assyr.*, *25.* No. IV, Paris 1928, pp. 159–168. Immediately after the visit of M. de Mecquenem this graffito was obliterated with tar by some busybody. R. Pfister has made the study of ancient textiles his speciality. He has described the Sassanian *gobelins* of the Lyons Museum in *Rev. des Arts Asiatiques*, VI, No. i, pp. 1–23. J. Orbeli and C. Trevers have published on the occasion of the III. International Congress of Iranian Art and Archaeology, held at Leningrad in 1935, Orfèvrerie Sassanides, Objets en or, argent et bronze du Musée de l' Ermitage.

What concerns Muhammadan archaeology, A. Godard and A. U. Pope have published articles on Islamic monuments in several numbers of the *Āthār e Irān* and *Bull. of Amer. Inst. for Pers. Art and Archaeol.* E. Herzfeld, Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra. Forschungen zur Islamischen Kunst. Berlin 1924, is important for the influence of the Samarra School on Iran in the ninth century A. D. The find of a potter's kiln at Susa with sherds of lustre-ware in 1927 has proved that the famous lustre-ware were also manu-factured at Susa and not always imported from Samarra. Raymond Koechlin, Les céramique musulmanes de Suse au Musée du Louvre, *Mém. Miss.*, XVII, is a useful publication on the subject. It is richly illustrated with coloured and black and white photographs.

Finally, I may mention Luristan bronzes, which have in the last decade flooded the museums of Europe and America, and some private collections. They were mostly found in graves dug in the mountainous region of Luristan, extending from the southern extremity of the Zagros Mountains to the mountains of the Pushte-Kuh, particularly in the environs of the towns of Harsin and Alishter. These graves are rectangular pits. with sides sometimes protected by slabs of stone, and covered always by another slab. They are very rich, as the dead are buried with their personal ornaments, arms and bronze decorations of the harness of their horses. Characteristic among the arms are axes of a particular shape, faintly evoking a horse's head and neck adorned by a mane. It is not easy to fix the date of these bronzes, as they appertain to different periods, roughly from 1500 B. C. to the Sassanian period, according to R. de Mecquenem. G. Contenau attributes them to the iron age. Before the excavations at Nehavend, which lies at the foot of the northern extremity of the Zagros Mountains, antique-dealers used to give the provenance of these bronzes as Nehavend. It was at Nehavend that the famous well-baked sonorous jars with stylised animalistic decorations, painted in black on a yellowish surface, were found in graves very often accompanied by axes, poniards and other bronze objects. The date of these jars and other objects can be fixed between the XXVIIIth and XXVth centuries B. C. by their comparison with similar objects found at Susa in the graves of these centuries. G. Contenau attributes them to the bronze age; see *Manuel d'Archéologie Orientale*, Tome III, Paris 1931, pp. 1576–1577.

Iranian numismatics begins with the coins struck by the Achaemenian sovereigns and their satraps. The coins of Darius I

opens the series of Achaemenian coins. Before them, the coins of Croesus, the king of Lydia (568–554 B. C.), whom Cyrus the great had defeated and captured in 547 B. C., were current in Iran, as we can deduce from the gold coins of Croesus found with the gold Darics in the stone-casket, containing the gold and silver plates, found in the ruins of Persepelis. G. F. Hill has published the coins of this period preserved in the British Museum in the Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia and Persia, London 1922, and J. Babelon those preserved in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris in Collection du Duc de Luynes. Monnaies grecques III. Paris 1930. Very few Achaemenian coins were discovered during the course of scientific excavations on different sites in Iran and adjoining countries.

The classification of Achaemenian coins, which are all without legends, was based by E. Babelon on a minute examination of the effigies of the sovereigns. This has been supported in principle by G. F. Hill and J. de Morgan. The coins of the Achaemenian satraps, struck in Phoenicia, have lgends in Aramaic characters, among which the coins of Mazaios, the satrap of Cilicia (362–328 B. C.), is worth noting. Allotte de La Fuÿe, E. Babelon and R. Dussaud have made important contributions to the deciphering of Aramaic legends. A necklace of Phoenician workmanship was discovered at Susa in the ruins of a Sassanian palacial building in 1931. It consisted of several rows of silver beads and had probably in the last row gold and silver pendants with embossed and découpé designs and one hundred and one silver coins (tetroboles, trioboles and oboles) struck by the Phoenician city-kings, who were dependent on the Achaemenian sovereigns. This was an exceptional find; see my article in *Mém. Miss.*, XXV, pp. 77 seq.

The successors of Alexander the Great, the Seleucid kings of Syria, had ruled in Iran from 312 to 246 B. C., when Arsaces, the founder of the Parthian-Arsacid dynasty, rebelled against Seleucus II and invaded Parthia. The power of the Parthians continued to increase until Mithridates I defeated and captured the Seleucid king, Demetrius II Nicator in 140 B. C. This historical fact was corroborated by two hoards of Alexandrine and Seleucid coins, discovered at Susa in 1934 and 1935, in which the latest coins were those of Demetrius II, dated 168 of the Seleucid era. The same fact is further supported by the rarity of the coins of his successors at Susa and elsewhere in Iran. Important is also the discovery of four coins of the Alexandrine type in one of these hoards, two with

Aramaic and two with Himyarite legends, which shows the commercial relations of Susa with northern Arabia in about 200 B. C. Further, a small collection of oboles of a certain Tigraios was found at Susa in 1935. Allotte de La Fuÿe has identified this king with Molon who revolted in Babylonia against Antiochus III in 222 B. C.; see my article entitled Notes de numismatique. Fouilles de Suse 1934., *Revue Numismatique*, Paris 1935, pp. 155-162 et pl. V.

The outstanding merit of the classification of the Parthian coins is to the credit of Colonel Allotte de La Fuÿe. A lucky find of 1478 drachms of Phraates IV made at Susa in 1927 showed ten types and fifty-seven sub-types of the drachms of this king, and led to the probable interpretation of certain monograms frequently found on Parthian coins; see *Mém, Miss.*, XXV, pp. 39-60, and plates. E. T. Newell has recently contributed to the study of Parthian oboles.

Alexander Farkas, an ardent collector of Bactrian coins, has tried to prove the authenticity of certain Parthian gold coins in my collection and in that of E. Herzfeld, although all classical and numismatic authorities do not support him; see his Comparaison entre la numismatique des princes de Transylvanie et la numismatique antique, Aiud-Nagyenyed 1932.

The Greek city of Seleucia on the Tigris has issued copper coins of the city-goddess (Boulé) type with different motifs of the reverse during the short periods of their frequent revolts against the Parthian sovereigns. Some of these coins bear the dates 127, 128, 129 and 130 of the Seleucid era, and in stray instances they give even the Seleucid months, just as a unique find made at Susa in 1935 shows. It is again Allotte de La Fuÿe who had classified the coins of the kings of Elymaïs in his important article entitled Monnaies d'Élymaïde, *Mém. Miss.*, VIII, pp. 177-243, pl. X-XIV. He has made certain emendations to this classification in several articles contributed to the *Rev. Num.* It has been noticed in many instances that the drachms and tetradrachms of Elymaïs, which are classed as copper, were once silver-coated (saucé d'argent).

The discovery of the coins of Persis and the reading of their Aramaic legends have proved the existence of quasi-independent princes, who bore Achaemenian names, during the whole of the Parthian period, with Persepolis as their capital. Our knowledge of this series of oriental coins is due to the researches of numismatists like Lenormant, Mordtmann, Markoff, Drouin, Babelon, Allotte de La Fuÿe and J. de Morgan.

It was again Allotte de La Fuÿe, who deciphered the Greek and Aramaic legends on the coins of Characene and thereby established the chronology of its princes. A hoard of more than two-thousand small lead coins (hemioboles) of Characene with fragmentary legends found at Susa in 1938 suggests that they were probably silver-coated.

J. de Morgan has with his, versatility in different branches of archaeological and oriental researches, introduced in numismatics the facsimile-reproduction of legends on coins, whether they are in Greek, Aramaic or Pahlavi, as we can see in his Manuel de Numismatique Orientale, fasc. I–III, Paris 1923–1936. The importance of the facsimile-reproduction of legends can be judged from the help it gives in determining the relative chronology of the later Parthian, Elymaïde and Characene coins. During the first century A. D. the Greek legends on the coins of these series show a similar decadence.

Sassanian numismatics owes its progress to Drouin, Markoff, Mordtmann, J. de Morgan, Nützel, Vasmer and von-Zambaur. The classification of Sassanian coins was relatively easy, thanks to distinctive crowns worn by Sassanian sovereigns on their coins and to the legends giving their names. In the early decades of this century Framji J. Thanevala had contributed several articles to the *Journal of the Numismatic Society of Bengal* on unpublished coins of his collection, which was unique in Bombay. The comparative study of mint-marks on Sassanian and Arabo-Sassanian coins of Arab governors of different provinces of the Sassanian empire, carried on for years by J. Walker of the British Museum, has settled the interpretation of many mint-marks. Walker has published the results of his studies in a Catalogue of Muhammadan Coins in the British Museum, A Catalogue of Arab-Sassanian Coins, London 1941. The ambiguity of Book–Pahlavi characters is well-known and as the Sassanian coins of the later epoch have legends in similar characters, the unique hoard of 2248 drachms of Chosroes I and his successors has been published by me with their legends in facsimile-reproduction in *Mém Miss.*. XXV, pp. 68–76 and a table of inventory, following therein de Morgan. The same method has been followed by me in Coins of Ṭabaristān, Paris 1938, a work in which all coins of Tabaristan existing in ten chief museums of Europe and in some private collections have been published with forty-six plates of their catalogue with legends in facsimile-reproduction. On the authority of these coins the

chronological list of the Ispāhbads and Arab governors of Tabaristan, known from Mordtmann, Valentine and Vasmer could be definitely emended.

That there exist Sassanian issues of lead coins, perhaps once silver-plated, of several early sovereigns has been proved by finds from Susa and Ahwaz. They have been published by me in *Mém. Miss.*, XXV and in the Coins of Tabaristān.

Furdoonji D. J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins, Bombay 1924, is an important work, comprising historical materials and numerous plates, illustrating the coins of his collection and those of the collection of Bartholomaei.

J. de Morgan, Numismatique de la Perse Antique, fasc. I–III, Paris 1927–1933, treats of the coins of all Iranian series mentioned above. They are illustrated by 78 plates.

Drouin and Allotte de La Fuÿe have determined a series of coins with legends in special characters as Sogdian. The latter has published these coins in two monographs, entitled Monnaies incertaines and la Sogdiane et des contrées voisines in *Rev. Num.*, Paris 1910 and 1927. He has given in the first monograph a historical sketch of Sogdiana and its princes.

The Hephthalites or the White Huns had issued their coins on the Sassanian model. These coins are divided into many categories, according to the motifs of their reverse, among which the Sassanian fire-altar, flanked on either side by an attendant, is the most frequent. They have been published by Cunningham in *Numismatic Chronicle* of 1894. Most of them have legends in Hephthalite and Pahlavi, some in Pahlavi and Brāhmī, a few in Hephthalite, Pahlavi and Brāhmī, and others even in Hephthalite, Pahlavi and Arabic characters. I have given the readings of the Pahlavi legends of these coins in a paper read before the XI. All India Oriental Conference, held at Hyderabad in December 1941.

A few copper coins with Pahlavi and Arabic legends have been recently discovered in Iran, especially at Susa. Only twenty-five such coins have been known up to date. They have been published by me in *Num. Chron.*, 1937, pp. 280–296.

As regards Musulman numismatics, Eduard von Zambaur is working for several years on the chronology of Muhammadan rulers from ancient times up to date with references to their coins. He has already made a list of their dates and mints. The young curator of the department of oriental coins in the Kasier Friedrichs Museum of

Berlin has collected important materials on the Arab glass-weights, preserved in the above museum, a big collection of which comes from Egypt. They are important for controlling the remarks of Maqrizi on the coinage of the Caliphs. Similar glass-weights must have existed in Iran, but they are not found in the ruins up to date.

Abbreviations

Abh. Preuss. A. W. — Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

(Act. Or.) — Ex Actorum Orientalium.

(Amer. J. Sem. Lang. & Lit.)—American Journal for Semitic Languages and Literature.

(Ann. Mus. Guimet. Bibl. Vulg.) — Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation.

Archäol. Mitt. Iran. —Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran.

Bull. Amer. Inst. for Pers. Art & Archaeol.—Bulletin of the American Institute for Persian Art and Archaeology.

(B. S. L. P.) — Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris.

B. S. O. S. — Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies.

(Bull. Soc. Sc. d'Azerbeijan)— Bulletin de la Société Scientifique d'Azerbeijan.

(C. R. Acad. Inscr. Paris) — Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Letters, Paris.

(E. R. E.) — Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics.

(Gaz. des Beaux Arts.) — Gazette des Beaux Arts.

Gibb Mem. Ser. — Gibb Memorial Series.

(Indo-Iran Stud.) — Indo-Iranian Studies.

I. F.. — Indogermanische Forschungen.

J. A. — Journal Asiatique.

J. A. O. S. — Journal of the American Oriental Society.

J. Cama Or. Inst. — Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute.

(J. Hell. Stud.) — Journal of Hellenic Studies.

(J. Num. Soc. Bengal). — Journal of the Numismatic Society of Bengal.

J. R. A. S.	— Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
(J. Soc. of Arts.)	— Journal of the Society of Arts.
KZ.	— Kuhns Zeitschrift.
Mém. Délég.	— Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse.
(Mém. Délég. Afghanistan.)	— Mémoires de la Délégation en Afghanistan.
Mém. Miss.	— Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse.
Mitt. Anthrop. Ges. Wien.	— Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft zu Wien.
M. O.	— Le Monde Oriental.
(Modi Mem. Vol.)	— Dr. Modi Memorial Volume.
(O. L. Z.)	— Orientalische Litteratur-Zeitung.
Pavry Or. Stud.	— Pavry Oriental Studies.
Publ. Soc. Étud. Iran.	— Publication de la Société des Études Iraniennes.
(Reports R. Dan. Soc.)	— Reports of the Royal Danish Society.
Rev. Archéol.	— Revue Archéologique.
(Rev. d'Assyr.)	— Revue d'Assyriologie.
(Rev. des Arts Asia.)	— Revue des Arts Asiatiques.
Rev. Num.	— Revue Numismatique. Paris.
(R. H. R.)	— Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.
S. Heidelberger A. W.	— Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.
S. Preuss. A. W.	— Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Studi e Materiali.	— Studi e Materiali della Storia delle Religioni.
W. Z. K. M.	— Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Z. D. M. G.	— Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

The abbreviations in brackets are not used.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF EPIC AND PURANIC STUDIES

By

A. D. PUSALKER

In common with other branches of Indology there has been quite an amount of valuable addition of books and articles in the domain of Epic and Purāṇic studies. These are of unequal merit and importance. In the following pages I propose to refer to the more important publications during the last twenty-five years concerning the *Mahābhārata*, *Bhagavadgītā*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Purāṇas*.[1]

1. The Mahābhārata

One of the main tasks set before it by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute was the preparation of a critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*, and the publication of parts of the *Mbh* constitutes the most epoch-making, stupendous and colossal work during the last quarter. The *Mbh* has always held an important position in the Indian Culture, and the need of a critical edition of the national epic was always felt and pressed by eminent Indologists like Winternitz and Macdonell.[2] Earlier studies of the *Mbh* were vitiated, being based on a defective text. In matters of grammar, metrics, history, religion and sociology, it was uncertain whether conclusions were based on old material of the epic or on mere variant readings of no great authority. In the light of the critical edition, however, we can now point out the lapses of earlier scholars. That the statistics

---

1. I must at the outset record my deepest obligations to my revered *guru*, Dr. V. S. **Sukthankar**, who not only placed his unique collection of articles and papers at my disposal, but gave me a number of valuable suggestions and notes outlining the plan, especially regarding the *Mbh* studies. But for his help, it would not have been possible for me to complete the work within the limited time. I have also to thank my friend Dr. R. N. **Dandekar** for giving me an opportunity of surveying the epic and Puranic material by entrusting the work to me. I am also indebted to Dr. **Manilal Patel**, Director of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, for allowing me to do this work as part of my office duty. I only hope that my survey will give a fairly good idea of the work done during the last twenty-five years, and that I have left out nothing of any importance.

2. **Winternitz**, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, I, pp. 467 ff.;
Macdonell, *Hist. Skt. Lit.*, pp. 282 ff.

and conclusions of Hopkins on the epic metre will require to be restudied is patent on the face of it, as some of the stanzas which form the basis of them have been found to be interpolations, and many readings of the others in the vulgate have been changed; Edgerton has referred to some such instances.[3] Sukthankar has pointed out the blunder of Oldenberg in regarding one passage as a survival from the oldest form of the epic, which Ms evidence proves to belong to the latest interpolations in the epic.[4] Edgerton refers to the waste of valuable time in interpreting defective readings of the vulgate text.[5] It has been found that the vulgate modernised many of the archaic lines of the original.[6] The large number of interpolations of chapters printed at the end of the critical text and of individual lines or stanzas printed in the footnotes, amply shows the amount of uncertain matter that may have crept into earlier studies and conclusions.

European scholars undertook preparation of an international edition of the epic and some preliminary work was done; but the last world war prevented any further progress and the scheme was finally abandoned. The Bhandarkar Institute formed an Editorial Board of eminent scholars for the critical edition of the *Mbh* with Utgikar as the Editor, and the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar inaugurated the work by writing the first *maṅgala śloka* in April 1919. The work proceeded on systematic and scientific lines. Utgikar pointed out, on a study of select chapters of the epic, that the Devanāgarī recension also had a longer and a shorter text.[7] The preliminary work consisted of the preparation of tables of available Mss and collation of the text of the Parvasaṁgraha and consideration of the Javanese version of the *Virāṭaparvan*, which proved that the southern recension was learnt in Java.[8] Winternitz and Thomas approved of the scheme, and the tentative edition of the *Virāṭaparvan* based on 16 Mss was published by the Institute in 1923. It contained 2050 stanzas, divided into 67 chapters. The world of Orientalists hailed the work with approval, and Winternitz in the course of his review offered some suggestions.[9] Later researches proved that

3. *JAOS*, 59, p. 165.
4. *Kane Festschrift*, p. 474 (n 7).
5. *JAOS*, 59, p. 368.
6. **Sukthankar,** Epic Studies (I), *JBBRAS*, IV, p. 161.
7. *ABORI*, I, pp. 145-155; II, pp. 73-77.
8. **Utgikar,** *ABORI*, II, pp. 155-188.
9. *ABORI*, V. pp. 19-30.

Utgikar placed too much reliance on the Parvasaṁgraha data, believing it to be the same in both the Northern and Southern recensions, and relied on the Kumbhakonam Edition (which is really a curious blend of the N. and S. recensions) as the S. recension.

Utgikar, however, resigned in 1924, and Sukthankar took charge as the General Editor in 1925. The first fascicule of the critical edition of the *Ādiparvan* appeared in 1927, and subsequent fascicules have followed at regular intervals. The complete *Ādiparvan* was published in 1933 along with *Prolegomena*, which, though chiefly concerned with the *Ādiparvan*, covers practically all aspects of the *Mbh* text-criticism, and is a brilliant exposition of the entire text-problem. The publication of the critical edition of the Ādiparvan has been acclaimed as "the most important event in the history of Sanskrit philology since the publication of Max Müller's edition of the *Ṛgveda*" by Winternitz.[10]

From the first the undertaking of the critical edition was an epoch-making work in a number of ways. It was a national work. Nothing of the kind has been attempted in India before; and when complete, this huge, herculean work will pale into insignificance any literary event accomplished hitherto in India. The publication has been uniformly greeted with applause and approbation by all Indologists, and the resolutions of the All-India Oriental Conference, the International Congress of Orientatists and the American Oriental Society, expressing their approval of "the eminently satisfactory manner in which the work is being done by the Institute", bear ample testimony to the immense value of the critical edition according to competent academic bodies. The *Prolegomena*, to which we shall presently refer, has vindicated Indian scholarship in the eyes of the European scholars. The colossal task demanded in the editor philological acumen, keen insight–almost a sixth sense for spotting the right reading,–and Sukthankar possesses these qualities to a very high degree, being qualified for this "monumental task by learning, training, skill and enthusiasm[11]" Indeed no better testimony may be found to Sukthankar's worth than the remarks of Winternitz who states: "Neither in India nor in Europe any one scholar will be found who could have done the work better than Dr. Sukthankar has done."[12]

10. *ABORI*, XV, p. 159.
11. **Dewherst** in *JRAS*, 1931, p. 466.
12. *Indol. Prag.*, I, p. 67.

The *Prolegomena* is a model of good temper, moderation and objectivity. It will ever stand as the basis of textual criticism for all further works in Indian classics. The *Mbh* text has been definitely established, at all stages of its history, to have been "fluid and carelessly guarded", affording easy opportunities of addition, omission, alteration, conflation, athetisation, haphazard synthesis of divergent readings and versions and other diakeuastic activities, not only of careless scribes but also of a host of scholars, poets and reciters. The *Mbh* had all along been a living and growing text. The text tradition was not simple and uniform, but multiple and polygenous; and in the successive revisional and amplificatory activities it is now impossible to discover the elusive lost archetype. Hence the *Mbh* problem, as has been often repeated, is a problem *sui generis*,[13] and the general principles followed in critical editions of classical texts in Greek and Latin can be applied only with great limitations and reservations to Sanskrit. It is impossible to trace a genealogical tree of all Mss of the *Mahābhārata*. The peculiar conditions of transmission of the epic necessitate an ecclectic but cautious utilization of all Mss classes.[14] For text reconstruction a thorough critical study of the complicated text material of the epic is necessary.

The chief scripts represented by the Mss are Śāradā, Nepālī, Maithilī, Bengali, Devanāgarī, Telugu, Grantha and Malayalam. The Mss divide themselves primarily into the N. and S. recensions, and each is further subdivided into a smaller number of groups. Then N. recension resolves itself into the North-Western represented by the Śāradā version (with its Devanāgarī transcripts), and the Central represented by the versions in Nepālī, Maithilī, Bengali and Devanāgarī ; and the S. into the Telugu and Grantha, and Malayalam versions.

The secondary testimonia comprise the Javanese version (c. 10th cent.), the Āndhra adaptation by the Telugu poets Nannaya Bhaṭṭa (11th cent.) and his successors, the *Bhāratamañjarī* of the Kashmirian Kṣemendra (11th cent.), and the Persian translation made in the reign of Akbar. The versions of the different commentators such as Devabodha, Arjunamiśra, Ratnagarbha, Nīlakaṇṭha, Vādirāja and Caturbhuja also figure among those whose readings

13. *JBBRAS*, IV, p. 157; *ABORI*, XI, p. 262; XV, p. 164; *IHQ*, XI, p. 598; &c.

14. *Prolegomena*, p. lxxxv f. As all my observations are based on the *Prolegomena*, I have not given references to it in order not to swell the footnotes.

are taken into account in the critical notes of the different parvans.

There is a large number of "misch-codices", Mss giving text not only of one particular version, but a mixture of the readings belonging to different versions and even recensions. The Mss material has been classified according to scripts. One of the remarkable results of the investigations of Sukthankar is the establishment, for the first time, of a Kashmirian version of the text. The "Śāradā Codex" was purchased by Bühler for the Bombay Government in 1875 and was lying unused on the shelves of the Deccan College Collection for 50 years until its resurrection by Sukthankar. The Kashmirian version has been proved to be the best and most authentic of extant versions. It is the shortest of all versions, interpolations in it being relatively few. Edgerton also admits its importance by calling it the 'oldest and best' text,[15] and Winternitz justifies the preference given to the Kashmirian version.[16] It has, however, its own eccentricities. The Śāradā text thus is the *textus simplicior*, the southern text being the *textus ornatior*. The best representative of the southern recension is the Malabar version. The text has been constituted not on any subjective grounds, but on the clear evidence of the Mss themselves in order to purge it of numerous later additions, spurious *ślokas* and long passages.

The general principles enunciated in the *Prolegomena* have been proclaimed to be 'unquestionably sound' by all reviewers.[17] Sukthankar has referred to such principles, which have been admitted by all.[18] Agreement between the N. (Kashmirian) and the S. (Malabar) recensions has been taken as the great indication for originality. Where two classes of Mss agree in opposition to other two classes, preference has been given to that side on which the Kashmir Mss stand. Preference again has been given to the reading which best suggests how other readings might have arisen. Interpretation receives precedence over emendation, and the more difficult reading has been preferred to the simpler one. Hiatus is to be restored wherever we find variants in the Mss which may be explained by assuming them to be the different efforts by scribes

15. *JAOS*, 49, p. 283.
16. *ABORI*, XV, p. 169.
17. cf. **Winternitz**, *ABORI*, XV, p. 169; **Keith**, *IC*, III, p. 768; **Edgerton**, *JAOS*, 48, p. 188; **Banerji-Sastri**, *JBORS*, 1929, p. 283.
18. *ABORI*, XVI, pp. 90-91.

unaccustomed to hiatus to remove the irregularity. Irregular sandhis also formed part of the original Mss tradition.[19] The grammatical and metrical irregularities of the original are responsible for quite a large fraction of the mass of variations which the editors came across in the Mss. Sastri's view that the northern text is 'mutilated' has been proved to be untenable.[20] The constituted text based on ecclectic principles will, no doubt, be more faithful than any single codex. Greatest difference of opinion, however, is possible with reference to the readings "less than certain", which have been indicated by waved lines, as the balance of Mss evidence is equally divided in their case. Many critics (though admitting the soundness of the general principles) have indicated passages where they would prefer other readings, most of which pertain to the waved line readings ; Sukthankar in his brilliant "Epic Studies" has stated reasons which have guided him in preferring the particular readings. The *Prolegomena* has once for all proved the futility of the Parvasaṁgraha argument, since the Parvasaṁgraha has been tampered with in different versions, and hence we must clearly abandon any hope of deriving any really useful information from it regarding the extent of the text. The established text is indeed a distinct contribution to the philological history of the epic in India.[21]

In spite of the difficulties and limitations in the way of text reconstruction of such a fluid and constantly changing text, the case is not so discouraging as might appear at first sight. There is a considerable part of the text where the N. and S. recensions are in full agreement, where there are no variants or really no important variants at all. A considerable number of passages can be constituted with an amount of certainty by agreement of versions between which the chances of mutual borrowings or contamination are *prima facie* the least likely, such as, e. g., those between Śāradā and Malayalam. Thus, a great deal of a fairly old text can be restored

19. **Keith** objected to the restoration of hiatus and irregular *Sandhi* (*IC*, III, pp. 766–771) ; but the oldest Nepalese Ms has confirmed **Sukthankar's** view (*ABORI*, XIX, pp. 211-15)

20. *Prolegomena*, p. xxvi.

21. **Ruben** and **Raghu Vira** are following the same technique and principles for their critical editions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and no better testimony can be found for the excellence and soundness of the *Prolegomena* than the change of an erstwhile critic into a staunch supporter, which I regard as the greatest triumph for **Sukthankar**.

for further critical study, and this, in fact, has been done by the critical edition.

70 Mss in all were collated for the first two chapters of the *Ādiparvan* ; but it was later found that 5 or 6 Mss of each class were sufficient to establish text of that version. Readings from 50 Mss have been given for the first two chapters, and from 38 for the rest. The total number of *ślokas* in the *Ādiparvan* (according to the Parvasaṁgraha) is 7984 ; and 121 long and 1634 short passages have been proved to be interpolations.

With regard to the readings adopted in the critical edition, it may be observed that subsequent researches and discoveries have almost invariably confirmed the correctness of the readings of the constituted text. Belloni-Filippi in his article on the Kadrū-Vinatā episode, justifies the excision of a passage (B. I. 22. 1–3 = No. 13 in App. I of the *Ādiparvan*), showing that there is no lacuna and the *textus simpilcior* is quite in order.[22] Lüders, on the ground of intrinsic probability, pleads for the preference of *satyaṁ cāmṛtam eva ca*, to which Edgerton had objected.[23] The oldest Nepālī Ms of the *Ādiparvan* 700 years old, confirms many of the readings of the constituted text, and justifies Sukthankar's views regarding hiatus and irregular *sandhi*.[24] Katre has noticed that the use of the optative form *iyāt* is not due to an error or irregularity, but it was the regular optative form of the epic.[25] In the controversy between Johnston and De,[26] regarding *kāñcana* in *Mbh* V. 19. 15, the reading in the critical edition has been confirmed by *kāñcana-druma-saṁnibha* in *Mbh* III, 40. 2. Edgerton in his "The Goat and the Knife" justifies the reading adopted by the critical text.[27] The division of the epic into 100 sub-parvans as listed by Sukthankar is corroborated by an old Gujarati translation of the *Mbh*.[28]

The recorded variants of the critical edition of the *Mbh* have opened up a new vista in the history of Indian Linguistics by paving a permanent way towards linguistic geography, and Indo-

22. *Ascoli Mem. Vol.*, 1930, pp. 174-180.
23. *OLZ*, 24, p. 1142 f.
24. " Epic Studies (VII)," *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 201-262.
25. *JAOS*, 57, pp. 316-317 ; *NIA*, I, p. 536, *Bull DCRI*, I, pp. 8-13.
26. *JRAS*, 1939, p. 220 f; 1940, pp. 69 ff.
27. *JAOS*, 59, pp. 366-368.
28. Forbes Gujarati Grantha Mala, Nos. 15, 20. It is dated saṁvat 1644 (= 1587 A. D.) ; it supports the critical edition in omitting Kaṇikanīti.

Aryan linguisticians were not slow to grasp the importance of the rich field awaiting investigation. These epic variants, if studied in the same way as the Vedic variants have been studied, are bound to add very considerably to our knowledge of epic language and literature. The critical edition has, in fact, reawakened general interest in the *Mbh* and given impetus to a number of subsidiary studies by Edgerton, Katre, Kulkarni, Mehendale, Sen Gupta, Shende and others.[29] Sukthankar's "The Bhṛgus and the Bhārata" is a fine specimen of higher criticism.[30]

Most of the reviews of the critical edition contained valuable matter, instead of being merely formal; and in this connection, mention may particularly be made of those by Winternitz, Lüders, Keith, Edgerton, Weller, Lévi, De, Nag, Lesný, Belloni-Filippi and Pisani.

Following the same principles as laid down in the *Prolegomena* and under the direction of the General Editor and with the help of his trained band of Pandits and scholars have appeared the subsequent volumes of the critical edition. Sukthankar's *Ādiparvan* was followed by *Virāṭaparvan* in 1936 edited by Raghu Vira; and it speaks very highly for the thoroughness and triumph of the principles and methods outlined by the General Editor that the editor of the *Virāṭaparvan* should admit that "the technique of reconstruction has been perfected to such a degree that the personality of the editor has been almost eliminated". As rightly observed by De, however, the skill and judgment of the mind that guides a critical work like this can never be dispensed with.[31] The *Virāṭaparvan* is the "*maṅgala*" of the *Mbh* reciters, and the problem of the *Virāṭaparvan* within the *Mbh* is *sui generis*. We are told that nowhere in the entire *Mbh* two recensions recede from each other so widely as in the *Virāṭa*, the shortest of the major Parvans, and this would be evident from the fact that out of 1834 stanzas in the text, the editor is sure about only 300, the rest bear wavy line. The editor has utilised 32 Mss; his testimonia comprise not less than 15 commentaries, Kṣemendra's *Bhāratamañjarī*, Javanese version, etc. For the *Virāṭa*, the Śāradā and Kashmirian Mss do not form separate

29. **Sen Gupta** is working on "Studies in Epic Grammatical Forms" for his doctorate thesis at the Dacca University; **Shende** obtained the Ph. D. of the Bombay University for his thesis on the "Bhṛgvāṅgirasa Element in the *Mahābhārata*". We have referred to the works of other scholars later on.

30. "Epic Studies (VI)", *ABORI*, XVIII, pp. 1-76.

31. *IHQ*, XIII, p. 370.

categories: they are equally good. There are 1178 interpolated passages in the footnotes and 62 long passages in Appendix I. Various concordances have been given; there is also a comparison between the Javanese version and the critical edition.

The *Udyogaparvan* made its appearance next in 1940 under the editorship of that seasoned scholar and well-known Orientalist, S. K. De. 37 Mss were used for the *Udyoga*, and the testimonia include commentaries by Devabodha, Arjunamiśra, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Saṁkara, and Nīlakaṇṭha. The number of short additional passages is 595, and of lengthy insertions 14. The wavy line is not much in evidence. The *Udyoga* differs from the *Ādi* and *Virāṭa* in that the N. and S. recensions do not recede very materially from each other with regard to omission, transposition and variation of continuous passages. Sukthankar's views about the flexibility of *sandhis* and metrically defective lines in the original text have been borne out by the *Udyoga* also. The critical edition gives the Parvasaṁgraha figure for the *Udyoga* as 6698, and the constituted text contains 6063 stanzas and 197 chapters. Readings adopted in the *Udyoga* on independent grounds are confirmed by the Javanese extracts supplied by Juynboll. De fully endorses the remarks of Sukthankar and Raghu Vira about Sastri's edition of the *Mbh*, which he calls a 'misch-edition', as the text is composite, containing much adventitious matter from the North. Sukthankar, Raghu Vira and De have definitely shown that Sastri places too much reliance on a single Ms or a particular group of Mss which do not represent the best tradition of the recension, pins his faith to the Parvasaṁgraha figures of chapters and verses to which he makes his text conform by curiously strenuous manipulation of stanza and chapter division, against his Ms evidence[32]. Thus the edition is far from being critical, but it gives a continuous southern version in a handy form.

The *Āraṇyakaparvan* is in process of publication under the editorship of Sukthankar, and one fascicule has been published hitherto. 28 Mss have been utilised for the *Āraṇyaka*. Two important testimonia, viz. Devabodha's commentary and Javanese version, are lacking for the *Āraṇyaka*. The text of the *Āraṇyaka* is, relatively speaking, remarkably smooth as may be seen even from such exterior factors as comparative paucity of variants and wavy lines in relation to the *Ādi* and *Virāṭa*. The *Āraṇyaka* presents a

---

32. *Udyogaparvan*, BORI, Introduction.

curious phenomenon in that in this Parvan the N. version is considerably longer than the S.; the vulgate contains fourteen whole *adhyāyas* which are entirely lacking in the S. edition as also in the critical edition.

Edgerton has completed his work on the *Sabhāparvan*, and but for the present world war, it would have been out. Belvalkar has completed preliminary work in connection with the *Bhīṣmaparvan*, and the press copy is almost ready. Collation sheets have been prepared for all the remaining Parvans of the *Mbh*, which will now be taken up by competent scholars. It will thus be seen that the colossal work is making decidedly steady progress, and it will be no vain hope to expect the completion of the work within the next decade under the capable and competent guidance of the General Editor, Sukthankar.

We may now refer to some special features of the critical edition. Interpolations form an important aspect in this connection. We are apt to miss in the critical edition some of the interesting episodes which we were used to associate with the *Mbh*; but really speaking, we miss nothing of any importance in the critical edition. As regards interpolations, I may draw attention to the following that are the most interesting: Gaṇeśa episode; dramatic scene at the *svayaṁvara* of Draupadī; and Kaṇikanīti from the *Ādiparvan*: Durgā-hymns in the *Virāṭa* and the *Bhīṣma*: Śrī Kṛṣṇa clothing Draupadī in the *Sabhā*: Story of Durvāsas, when he comes to the Pāṇḍavas for dinner; and Urvaśī's advances to Arjuna in the *Āraṇyaka*: one *adhyāya* from the Sanatsujātīya in the *Udyoga*, which has not been commented on by Śaṁkara. Spuriousness of every one of these passages has been thoroughly established on indubitable Ms evidence. As already observed by Winternitz, not even one of the passages relegated to the footnotes or the Appendix " will be found to be a real loss to the epic as poetry ".[33]

Attention may also be drawn to the important discoveries of Sukthankar. He brought to light the old " Śāradā Codex " and established the "K" version. Then he pointed out the importance of Devabodha's commentary, which was collated for the first time. One of the fruitful results of the search for old Mss of the *Mbh* carried on by the B. O. R. I. was the discovery of the oldest Nepali Ms of the *Ādiparvan* discovered by Rajguru Hemraja Pandit.

33. *ABORI*, XV, p. 172

Before we proceed to the articles, let me emphasise the importance of the critical edition for scholars. Reference has already been made to the serious drawbacks of earlier studies owing to want of a critical edition of the text. Citations from the *Mbh.* are now-a-days useless unless they are authenticated, so to say certified, by the critical edition. Therefore for all scholarly purposes the critical edition should always be consulted and cited for the parvans so far published by the B. O. R. I.; otherwise the citations are as good as usless.

Inseparably connected with the question of the critical edition is the series of "Epic Studies" by Sukthankar, which attempts to answer with great precision and in detail, some of the fundamental criticisms levelled against the principles enunciated in the *Prolegomena* or their application in particular contexts. In the first, entitled "Some Aspects of the Mahābhārata Canon,"[34] Sukthankar sets forth his reasons for adopting particular readings in the text objected to by Weller and Edgerton, and maintains the enumeration of exactly 100 sub-parvans in the Parvasaṁgraha list. Epic Studies II : "Further Text-Critical Notes"[35] states the reasons that guided the editor in his choice of readings in question, which have been criticized by Winternitz. It has rightly been observed that we are apt to prefer the readings of the vulgate at first sight, which appear to be better than the constituted text. Ruben's criticisim[36] of the principles underlying the preparation of the edition and the constitution of the text has been effectively met in Epic Studies III[37]. Ruben states the aims and methods of classical philology, and writes about their application to the problem of the *Mbh* textual criticism; but these cannot be applied to the *Mbh* in toto. Ruben further contends that the Śāradā Ms as a matter of fact does not differ from other Mss, and that every contextual criterion is problematic. The first evidently is untenable; and after detailed discussion, Sukthankar has shown that the criterion of intrinsic probability is not problematic at all, but quite definite and conclusive. " More Text-Critical Notes "[38] form the next part of the Epic Studies. (IV). After

34. *JBBRAS*, IV, pp. 157–178.
35. *ABORI*, XI, pp. 165–191.
36. " Schwierigkeiten der Textkritik des Mahābhārata," *Acta Or.* 8, pp. 240–256.
37. "Dr. Ruben on the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata," *ABORI*, XI, pp. 259–283.
38. *ABORI*, XVI, pp. 90–113.

referring to the points from the *Prolegomena* on which there was consensus of opinion among scholars, Sukthankar sets forth in detail his reasons for the choice of the readings in the critical text in view of Winternitz's preference for certain other readings in his review of the *Ādiparvan.* We are later on coming to " Mahābhārata Commentators " (Epic Studies V)[39]. In " The Bhṛgus and the Bhārata " (Epic Studies VI),[40] Sukthankar has given myths and legends relating to the Bhṛgus occurring in the *Mbh*, to show the vital part played by the Bhṛgus in the shaping and development of the epic. It is also shown that the original *Bhārata* became the *Mahābhārata* at the hands of the Bhṛgus. This highly illuminating paper has served as the basis of other articles and dissertations which have pursued the subject further.[41] In the next paper on Epic Studies (VII), " The Oldest Extant Ms of the Ādiparvan ",[42] which is 700 years old and hails from Nepal, is described with a facsimile plate, collated with the published text, and it is shown that the Ms almost invariably supports the critical text.

In connection with the reading *hāsyarūpeṇa śaṁkaraḥ* (I. 57. 21) as against the vulgate *haṁsarūpeṇa ceśvaraḥ* supported by Winternitz and Meyer, appears a note under " Epic Questions (I) : Does Indra assume the form of a Swan ?"[43] Additional evidence in the form of the newly discovered Nepalese Ms has been adduced. It is doubted whether Indra in the context could have had any reason for assuming the form of Haṁsa as suggested by Meyer. The Haṁsa incarnation of Indra is shown to be " nothing more than a canard."

Now to turn to the other articles regarding text-criticism, interpretation, etc. Edgerton[44] has, on reconstructing a line from the *Sabhāparvan* with the first three syllables doubtful, (B. II. 31, 72 ab : C. II. 1175 cd ; Crit. Ed. II, 28. 49 ab) concluded that if Kern's identification of Yavanapura with Alexandria be right and if his own conjecture as to Antioch should prove to be a good guess, then this single line of the *Mbh* would refer to three most important cities of

---

39. *ABORI*, XVII, pp. 185–202.

40. *ABORI*, XVIII, pp, 1–76.

41. **Weller**, "Who were the Bhriguids?" *ABORI*, XVIII, pp. 296–302; **Karmarkar**, " Dr. Sukthankar's Theory...and the light it throws on the Dravidian problem" *ABORI*, XX, pp. 21–24 ; Agrawala, " Bhṛguvaṁśa aur Bhārata," *NPP*, Śrāvaṇa 1997, pp. 105–162.

42. *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 201–262. "Epic Studies (VIII)," dealing with *Rāmopākhyāna* and *Rāmāyaṇa* is mentioned later on.

43. *Bull. DCRI*, I, pp. 1–7.

44. " Rome and (?) Antioch in the Mahābhārata " *JAOS*, 58, pp. 262–265.

the Hellenistic-Roman world: Antioch, Rome and Alexandria;—evidently the oldest mention of Rome or Romans in Indian literature. In "The Goat and the Knife,"[45] Edgerton first gives the fable and refers to the corrupt vulagate text, II. 66. 8, which stands as II. 59. 9 in the critical edition. The vulgate is defective in three *pādas* and no sense can be made out of it. Edgerton stresses the importance of the critical edition. "Epic Triṣṭubh and its Hypermetric Varieties"[46] by Edgerton draws attention to at least two radically different types of *triṣṭubh-jagatī*, one found in the *Sabhā* and the other in the *Virāṭa*. Hypermetric *triṣṭubhs* occur only in the *Sabhā* type, never in the *Virāṭa* type. Submetrical lines are very few. Lévi in his "*Tato jayam udīrayet*"[47] states that the *Mbh* glorifies the Kṣatriya caste and the ideal rôle assigned to it in the Hindu society, and points out to the Kṣatriyas the glory of the god who guarantees them success and safety. Rajaguru Hemaraja, the discoverer of the oldest Nepalese Ms of the *Ādiparvan*, has contributed an interesting and instructive article in Sanskrit: "Some Reflections on the Mahābhārata"[48], which discusses some important problems connected with the history of the epic. He shows that there is no separate work called *Jaya*, but it denotes *Bhārata* and *Mahābhārata*, which are respectively by Vyāsa and Vaiśampāyana, with 24,000 and 100,000 stanzas. Another extremely important paper is by Pisani entitled "The Rise of the Mahābhārata".[49] The author praises the critical edition of the *Mbh*, and regards the epic as the conscious work of a poet, in which didactic and aupākhyānic matter as well as single didactic episodes have been inserted according to a plan. The *Bhagavadgītā*, according to Pisani, is the heart and kernel of the *Mbh*. The author of the epic was a Brāhmaṇa and a Bhārgava, and he has employed the already existing material consisting of (i) the old *Bhārata* and *Mahābhārata*, (ii) single episodes relating to the heroes of the Bhārata saga, etc., (iii) edifying *upākhyānas*, religious and moral, (iv) Brahmanical traditions, etc., and to this he added his own creations. The *Mbh* has arisen between the 2nd and 4th cent. A. D. In "Siṁśumāraśiraḥ",[50] V. S. Agrawala disputes *śiṁśumārapuraṁ* in the critical edition (I. 176. 15), and maintains the reading *śiṁśumāraśiraḥ* as preserved in the vulgate (I. 185. 16) on

45. *JAOS*, 59, pp. 366–368.
46. *JAOS*, 59, pp. 159–174.
47. *Bhand. Comm. Vol*, p. 97 ff.
48. *ABORI*, XVI, pp. 212–231.
49. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 166–176.
50. *JISOA*, 1939, pp. 168–169.

the ground that *śiṁśumāraśiraḥ* means *makaratoraṇa*, " the architrave of the gateway adorned with fish-tailed crocodile ". Agrawala has also contributed " Mahābhārata Notes ",[51] in which he deals with (i) *vāraṇau ṣaṣṭihāyanau*, (ii) *dvaipa* and *vaiyāghra*, (iii) *upasṛtaḥ*, (iv) *haraṇa* and (v) the story of Yavakrīta. In a paper appearing elsewhere in the Jubilee Volume he deals with *Vapraprākāra*. " Literary Styles in the Mahābhārata "[52] is an article in Hindi by the same scholar, in which he refers to the seven different styles employed by the author of the epic as necessitated by different occasions. Dasharatha Sarma interprets the word " upatalpa " to mean " a small tower or turret".[53] F. Otto Schrader in "Apocryphal Brahmapurāṇa"[54] shows that chapters 235–244 of the *Brahmapurāṇa* have been borrowed from different chapters of the *Śāntiparvan*, though many readings of the *Purāṇa* disagree with those in the *Śāntiparvan*. A. P. Banerji-Sastri draws attention to "A Mithilā copy of the Śalyaparvan of the Mahābhārata"[55] dated Śaka 1537, Saṁvat 1672 (i. e., 1615 A.D.), and gives variants with the Kumbhakonam Edition. Arabic version of the *Mbh* legend as translated into French by M. Reinaud from the original Persian work " Modjmel-altevarykh ", has been given by R. G. Harshe.[56]

Turning now to linguistic studies, we find that the critical edition has supplied vast material for systematic study in various ways, e. g., on regional basis also by grouping the variants under different heads with relation to the Ms sources. Katre has referred to the usage of epic *iyāt* as equivalent of a general past tense, though optative in form.[57] In "Verbs of Movement and their Variants in the Critical Edition of the Ādiparvan,"[58] E. D. Kulkarni has presented the entire variant material according to the roots found in the constituted text, the variant forms being recorded in brackets, indicating the source of the reading concerned. Variants show the substitution of synonymic verbal bases for the difficult *iyāt*. M. A. Mehendale, on a study of the absolutives in the Critical Edition of the *Virāṭaparvan*, finds that absolutives in *-ya* far outnumber those

51. *ABORI*, XXI, pp. 280-284.
52. *Hindustani*, pp. 387-394.
53. *IC*, I, pp. 682-683.
54. *IC*, II, pp. 591-592.
55. *JBORS*, XXVII, pp. 570-592.
56. *Bull.* DCRI, II, pp. 314-324.
57. *JAOS*, 57, pp. 316-317; NIA, I, p. 536; *Bull. DCRI*, I, pp. 8-13.
58. *Bull. DCRI*, II, App. pp. 1-113.

in *-tvā*. Only two instances of irregular absolutives of non-compound roots and five of compound roots have been recorded.[59] "The Dative and its Variants" forms the first of a series of articles on "Case Variation in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata" by E. D. Kulkarni.[60]

Now we come to the different papers dealing with the episodes in the *Mbh.* While presenting the story of Janamejaya's Sarpasatra and the legends connected therewith, Winternitz[61] points out the striking parallels with similar myths of other countries; and concludes that the legend may have its origin in some prehistoric myth, or it may have spontaneously arisen in different countries from the same psychological motive of extirpating serpents. Utgikar considers the story of the Ṛṣi Aṇi Māṇḍavya in its Sanskrit and Buddhistic sources.[62] The comparison of the stories in the *Mbh, Purāṇas* and *Jātakas* shows that the story in the *Ādiparvan* is the original from which the other versions borrowed. Another paper by Utgikar compares the *Mbh* and *Jātaka* versions of several legends common to both.[63] The text of the story of Yayāti as found in the *Mbh* and the *Matsyapurāṇa* has been compared by G. P. Dixit,[64] principally from the metrical point of view; and the conclusion is that the metres of the *Matsya* belong to a later period of development than those of the *Mbh.* L. Hilgenberg in *Die Kosmographische Episode im Mahābhārata und Padmapurāṇa*[65] critically investigates the relation of *Mbh* cosmography with that given in the *Padma* and the other *Purāṇas*, and concludes that the *Mbh* account is based on the *Padmapurāṇa*, and that both these accounts are based on what Kirfel calls the longer group of the *Purāṇas*, while some passages come also from the relatively very late shorter group. Belvalkar examines the same relation giving citations from both texts, and proves the posteriority of the *Padmapurāṇa* version.[66] M. V. Vaidya compares the Tīrthayātrā in the *Āraṇyakaparvan* and the *Padma-Purāṇa*,[67] and concluds that the *Padma* definitely borrowed Tīrthayātrā from the *Āraṇyakaparvan*. H. G. Narahari draws attention to

59. *Bull, DCRI*, I, pp. 71-73.
60. *Bull. DCRI*, I, pp. 318-326.
61. Eng. transl. by **Utgikar** in *JBBRAS*, II.
62. *Proc. Or. Conf*, II, pp. 221-238.
63. *JBBRAS*, 1930, pp. 115-134.
64. *Proc. Or. Conf*, V, pp. 721-788.
65. Stuttgart, 1934.
66. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 19-28.
67. *Festschrif Kane*. pp. 530-537.

three recensions of the "Legend of Śunaḥśepa,"[68A] and shows that the Vedic version is the most popular of the three, the other two versions being given in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. Weller refers to the Mandapāla episode in his text-criticism of the *Mbh*.[68B]

Some papers deal with *Mahābhārata* citations. In " Mahābhārata and Ancient Commentaries, " Kane[69] brings together verses quoted from the Great Epic in ancient commentaries and works including those of Śabara, Kumārila, Śaṁkara, and traces them to the vulgate. In another paper, Kane traces the quotations in very ancient *Dharmasūtras* and other works to the *Mbh*.[70] He suggests that *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* was originally one work which split up into two, i. e. *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa*, and later into a number of *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*. Renou traces imitations of the *Ṛgveda* hymns and passages in connection with the hymn to Aśvins in the *Ādiparvan* (I. 3. 60–70).[71] V. M. Apte deals with 20 passages appearing as *Ṛgveda* citations in the *Mbh* tracing them to their sources.[72]

Commentaries play an important part in the Testimonia of the Critical Edition. In " Epic Studies (V) ", Sukthankar writes about the *Mbh* commentators.[73] 22 commentators have been enumerated, most of whom are older than the Mss utilised for the critical edition. Devabodha, the oldest commentator on the *Mbh*, shows close affinity with the Śāradā and K versions. He supports the critical edition in omitting the Kaṇikanīti. The chronological order enumerated by Sukthankar for the *Mbh* commentators runs: Devabodha–Vimalabodha – Sarvajñanārāyaṇa – Arjunamiśra – Nīlakaṇṭha. Sarvjañanārāyaṇa can be placed between 1100–1300 A. D. Arjunamiśra's Ms is dated 1534 A. D., and he is placed c. 1300 A.D. by J. C. Ghose,[74] and between 1400–1500 A. D. by Gode.[75] The latter scholar has written on the chronology of some commentators of the *Mbh*. The date of Vimalabodha's commentary on the *Mbh* called *Viṣamaślokī* is stated to be after 1150 A. D.[76] As against Sastri's date of 1339 A. D. for Vādirājatīrtha, Gode proves him to belong to 1571

---

68. A *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 302-307.
68. B " Zur Text-kritik des Mahābhārata," *Fest. Winternitz*, pp. 37-40.
69. *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 161-172.
70. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 128–133.
71. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 177–187.
72. *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 26–38.
73. *ABORI*, XVII, pp. 185–202.
74. *IC*, I, pp. 706-710; II, pp. 585–589.
75. *IC*, II, pp. 141–146.
76. *ABORI*, *XVII*, pp. 394-397.

A. D.[77] Ānandapūrṇa was hitherto posted to the 16th cent.; Gode, however, fixes the limits of the date of Ānandapūrṇa (alias Vidyāsāgara) between 1200–1350 A. D.[78] Raghavan puts Ānandapūrṇa Vidyāsāgara at about 1350 A. D. on the ground of the contemporaneity of Kāmadeva and Ānandapūrṇa, the former of whom can be assigned to 1350 A. D. on inscriptional data.[79] In contrast to C. V. Vaidya's view taking Nīlakaṇṭha Caturdhara to have flourished about 400 years ago, Gode shows him to belong to the period 1650—1700, i. e. about 260 years ago.[80] Raghavan has written notes on the fragment of a commentary of Varadarāja and a commentary of Yajñanārāyaṇa.[81]

About the chronology of the Bhārata war, it is well known that the orthodox view holds the Bhārata war to have taken place about 5000 years ago. D. S. Triveda has taken up that position and maintains it on the evidence of historical works, astronomy, etc., concluding that the war was fought in 3137 B. C.[82] Sen Gupta interprets some astronomical references from the *Mbh* to assign 2559 B. C. to the Bhārata war.[83] He has again written on Bhārata battle traditions, relying on Vṛddhagarga tradition, which shows that the Yudhiṣṭhira Era began in 2449 B. C.[84] The Āryabhaṭa tradition and Purāṇic testimony, which do not support this date, are regarded as erroneous by Sen Gupta. Deb places the date of the Bhārata war at 1400 B. C. after considering the astronomical data from Āryabhaṭa, Varāhamihira, and the reign periods and astronomical observations in the *Purāṇas*.[85] J. S. Karandikar has pointed out the first day of Mārgaśīrṣa as the date of the starting of the Bhārata war.[86]

Cosmography and geography of the *Mbh* form part of a number of articles. The veteran epic scholar Hopkins in "The Epic View of the Earth" refers to the seven great mountains and rivers as also to the peoples of India as stated in the *Mbh*.[87] Kasten Ronnow sug-

---

77. *ABORI*, *XVII*. pp. 203-210.
78. *BISM Qtly*, XX, pp. 29-36.
79. Reprint, pp. 1-5.
80. *Mīmāṁsā Prakāśa*, III, pp. 65-71.
81. *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 351-355.
82. *JIH*, XVI, iii; *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 515-525.
83. *JRASB*, Letters, III.
84. *JRASB*, Letters, IV.
85. *JASB*, XXI, pp. 211-220.
86. Sep. Paper.
87. *Journ. Ind. Sch. Ved. Res*, I, pp. 65-87.

gests the identity of the *Śvetadvīpa* mentioned in the *Mbh* with the Buddhist heavens by pointing out some coincidences between them.[88] On the strength of a reading found in an old *Mbh* Ms, Jaya Chandra Vidyālaṁkāra states that Ulūka mentioned in the Digvijayaparvan in connection with Arjuna's northern conquest is a misreading for Kulūta, which was the ancient name of the modern Kullu.[89] H. C. Ray Chaudhury has brought out some of his articles about Indian Cosmography from the Epics and the *Purāṇas* in book form.[90] Mention may be made of "The Study of Ancient Indian Geography", which specifically refers to the *Mbh* : and " India in Purāṇic Cosmography" and "The Mountain System of the Purāṇas" which mainly concern the *Purāṇas* though the *Mbh* is incidentally referred to at places.[91] Various ancient Indian tribes has been the pet subject of a number of interesting and important studies by B. C. Law. His "Mountains and Rivers of India"[92] and "Countries and Peoples of India"[93] bring together much valuable matter not only from the epics and the *Purāṇas*, but from the Buddhist sources, travel accounts, etc. as well. In "Saptadvīpā Pṛthivī" (illustrated), H. R. Mankad points out differences in Eastern and Western cartography and identifies seven islands and oceans.[94]

Finally we come to articles dealing with philosophy, mythology and miscellaneous matters connected with the *Mbh*. K. M. Jhaveri has referred to the " Ethic Discourses of Bhīṣma"[95] from the *Śāntiparvan* dealing with the duties of a king, ethics of war, administration, state of society, etc., giving citations from the epic. R. R. Iyengar has written about the Mokṣadharma philosophy in the *Mbh*, stating that the epic was mainly intended to appeal to the common people.[96] Kurtakoti has spoken about the great influence the *Mbh* has been exerting over the people of India.[97] The Kṛṣṇa problem has attracted the attention of a number of scholars. Tadpatrikar deals with the episodes from the life of Kṛṣṇa as described in the epic and in

88. *BSOS*, V, ii.
89. *JBORS*, XX, March 1934.
90. *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, Cal. Univ., 1932.
91. *op. cit.*, pp. 37-46 ; 61-93; 94-136.
92. *JDL*, Cal., XXVII.
93. *ABORI*, XVII, pp. 217-242 ; 319-339 ; cf. also *Festschrift Kane*, pp. (278-281 ; *ABORI*, XXI, pp. 203-212.)
94. *ABRI*, XVIII, pp. 225-240.
95. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pp. 36-42.
96. *IHQ*, II, pp. 509-515.
97. *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 1-7.

the different Purāṇic works.[98] S. L. Katre in "Kṛṣṇa and the Mahābhārata War" gives a detailed account from the *Mbh* of the part played by Kṛṣṇa in the *Mbh* war as well as his pre-war activities.[99] From a study of the Jarāsandha episode in the *Mbh* and the *Purāṇas*, S. L. Katre concludes that while the *Mbh* presents Kṛṣṇa in essentially human colours, the *Purāṇas* present him in pure divine colours; defeat, failure and humiliation have been transferred from Kṛṣṇa to Jarāsandha in the Purānic accounts.[100] In his "Politics and Political Ideas of the Mahābhārata",[101] N. C. Banerji deals with the general political condition of India, constitution of various states and the general state of Indian politics in those days as seen from the *Mbh*. Chamupati's "Sāmrājya of Yudhiṣṭhira" [102] refers to the various kinds of states in ancient India. K. G. Goswami shows that the institution of marriage is known to have prevailed in India from the earliest times and that the *Mbh* legend about Uddālaka Śvetaketu ordaining the institution has no evidentiary value.[103] In "Ekānaṁśā and Subhadrā", J. C. Ghosh points out that Ekānaṁśā mentioned in the *Mbh* as a daughter of Aṅgirasa becomes in the *Harivaṁśa*, Yogakanyā, the daughter of Yaśodā; this Ekānaṁśā was later on turned into Subhadrā.[104] Lachhmi Dhar shows the solar character of the Pāṇḍava heroes of the *Mbh*, the Kauravas being princes of darkness. Draupadī's wedding has been regarded as the epic version of the Vedic solar myth of Uṣas' marriage with the sun. The great war is the slaying of the dragon of darkness and the triumph of Uṣas.[105] Following Heras, A. P. Karmarkar takes the *Matsya* to be a direct borrowing of the proto-Indian cult, and shows that the legend of the fish underwent three different stages, viz. the *Śat. Brā*, the *Mbh* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*.[106] He has also taken Sukthankar's Bhṛgus and the Bhārata to apply to his Dravidian theory.[107] H. C. Ray Chaudhury, on the basis of Bhāsa's *Madhyama Vyāyoga* infers that there may have been an Upākhyāna in the

98. *Kṛṣṇa Problem*, Or. Book Agency, Poona; *ABORI*, X, pp. 269–344.
99. *Allahabad Univ. Studies*, VIII, pp. 193-222.
100. *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 500-508; IX, pp. 854-865.
101. *IHQ*, I, pp. 94-99; 323-330; 489-500.
102. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 523-530.
103. *Cal. Rev.*, Aug. 1939.
104. *JASB*, Letters, Vol. I, No. 3.
105. *Woolner Comm. Vol.*, pp. 311-316.
106. *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 253-257.
107. *ABORI*, XX, pp. 21–24.

Mbh dealing with Ghaṭotkaca's hostility to the Brāhmaṇas which may have been the source of Bhāsa's theme[108]. Bibhutibhusan Datta seeks to trace the prevalence of the system of decimal notation during the time of the *Mbh* (6th Cent B. C.) and even earlier[109]. "The Mahābhārata and Some Aspects of its Culture" by H. C. Ray Chaudhury speaks about the origin and antiquity of the epic, vicissitudes of the Aryan civilisation, kingship, theology, etc.[110] P. P. S. Sastri reviews the leading characters in the epic stating what each character stands for ; the *Mbh* age has been described as the golden age.[111] Moral ideas in epics in respect of property form the subject of U. C. Bhattacharjee's paper[112], and S. N. Bose in his ethnic study of the Pāṇḍavas shows that they were related to the Scythians.[113] J. L. Swellengrebel gives the story of the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas as given in the Korawāśrama, in old Javanese written in Purāṇic style[114]. R. C. Majumdar's important article, full of much valuable material and containing a mine of information on "Indo-Javanese Literature"[115] draws attention, among other things, to the old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*, old Javanese translations of the *Ādi*, *Virāṭa*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, *Āśrama*, *Musala*, *Prasthānika* and *Svargārohana*, to *Arjuna-vivāha*, *Koravāśrama* and the versions of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāna.*

On a consideration of Vedic, epic and *Purāṇic* texts Kshetreshachandra Chaṭṭopadhyāya has shown that Vedic orthodoxy looked upon suicide with abhorrence, which was considered meritorious by non-Vedic ascetics. Later on, Vedic orthodoxy compromised with the common culture of the land and approved of the 'religious suicide at Prayāga'[116].

Next, we come to the various books published on the *Mbh.* Sörensen's *Index*, though begun much earlier, was published posthumously in this period, revised and completed by Dines Anderson and Elof Olesen[117]. It gives concordance and summary of the Parvans and sub-parvans as also of narratives ; the index under

108. *Cal. Rev.*, Feb. 1934. It may be mentioned that Bhāsa might himself have invented the story.
109. *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā* (Bengali), vol. 41, No. 1.
110. *Cult. Heritage of India*, I, pp. 98-107.
111. " The Mbh Age," *Cult. Her.*, I, pp. 108-117.
112. *Mod. Rev.*, Oct. 1933, pp. 399-402.
113. *Mod. Rev.*, Dec. 1934, pp. 654-657.
114. *JGIS*, III, i.
115. *IC*, I, pp. 31-50.
116. *JUPHS*, X, pp. 65-79.
117. London, 1904-1925.

different names has been so arranged that running narrative can be got out of the references. Its value and importance in research work has been accepted by all scholars. Another posthumous work is the Italian versified translation (*Il Mahābhārata*) of selected episodes of the *Mbh* in 5 volumee, prepared by Michele Kerbaker and brought out by Carlo Formichi and Vittore Pisani[118]. It is in rhymed octaves, the rhyming generally being a b a b a b c c. E. P. Rice has published an *Analysis and Index of the Mahābhārata*,[119] which gives the summary of the epic, and (i) Index of Names and (ii) Index of Subjects under 15 different heads. The Subject-Index is the most valuable part. V. Venkatachella Iyer called his *Notes of a Study of the Preliminary Chapters of the Mahābhārata*,[120] an attempt to separate genuine from spurious matter. The book is based on a comparative examination of the four recensions of the epic and Nannayya's Telugu translation. The Appendix deals with "Draupadī and her five husbands", in which five different attempts to justify the polyandrous marriage have been considered. Oldenberg in *Das Mahābhārata*[121] dealing with its origin, contents and form, attempts to distinguish between the earlier and later stages of the epic; he brings in his pet Ākhyāna theory and holds that prose-poetry passages are the oldest portions of the *Mbh*. Oldenberg thinks that the ancient epic portrayed both parties in almost equal light and shade, rejoicing merely in the actual display of strength; the moral reflections cast on the conduct of the Pāṇḍavas pertain to a more modern age. N. V. Thadani's *Mystery of the Mahābhārata*,[122] covering 5 volumes and over 2000 pages, sets forth the author's pet theory that the *Mbh* is the symbolization of all the six systems of Hindu philosophy, and the story represents the conflict of the systems which meet in the region of mind. Kauravas are taken as representing Nyāya, and Pāṇḍavas as Vaiśesika; while Kunti is the earth, Karṇa the seed or vegetable kingdom, Draupadī the sacrifice of action, Kṛṣṇa the supreme Puruṣa, etc. That the *Mbh* is a history cannot be denied; and once the historical facts are ignored and symbolism and speculation come in, there is no limit to the conclusions that various authors may draw. Though one may not agree with the author's conclusions, and though some have regarded the attempt as a mere waste of valuable time and money, one cannot but admire the wonderful patience

118. Rome, 1933-1939.
119. London, 1934.
120. Madras, 1922.
121. Göttingen, 1922.
122. Karachi, 1931-1935.

and industry of the author. P. N. Mullick has published two books: *Mahābhārata, A Critical Study* and *Mahābhārata as a History and a Drama.*[123] Lack of index is a serious desideratum in both volumes. The author holds that the *Bhārata Saṁhitā*, which owed its origin to the Vedas and Vedāṅgas, existed before Vālmīki and Vyāsa, and dealt with duties of men in different stages of life and two distinct paths, of *saṁsāra* and *sannyāsa* : the original *Mbh* was not connected with the Pāṇḍavas. The second book deals with the historical and dramatic episode of the *Mbh*. According to the author, Vyāsa originally described the evil conduct of Dhṛtarāṣṭra's sons, goodness of Pāṇdavas, wisdom of Vidura, Virtue of Gāndhārī and constancy of Kuntī, ending with the divinity of Kṛṣṇa. The history thus culminates in the Rājasūya. Then the epic was remodelled with dramatic and Purāṇic admixture at the time of Janamejaya and Śatānīka. Bhīṣma, Droṇa. etc., are later additions. A very useful summary of the epic appears in these volumes. In one section of *Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture Origins*, N. N. Ghose[124] culls the material which formed the original Draupadī saga, and was subsequenntly added to and even altered by the Brahmin redactors; the Satyavatī-Bhīṣma colloquy and the Niyoga is a Brahmanical elaboration as also are Pandu's sons, Droṇa and Aśvatthāman, etc.; whatever part implies extravagant glorification of the Brahmin involving the humiliation of some other class, that is to be surely taken as a Brahmanic interpolation. *Bhā atāvarṣīya Prācina Caritra Kośa* (Dictionary of Biography in Ancient India, in Marathi) by S. V. Chitrav gives the biography of characters fiiguring in *Vedic*, post-*Vedic*, epic and *Purāṇic* literature, giving suitable reference.[125] It is the only book of its kind. Nundo Lal Dey's *Geographical Dictionary of India* supplies, *inter alia*, epic and Purāṇic references to various place-names. and identifies them.[126] His *Rasātala or the Underworld* refers, in addition, to western geographers.[127] Kirfel in his *Die Kosmgrapie der Inder*[128] makes a detailed investigation of the data offered not only by the *Saṁhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upaniṣads* and *Vedāṅgas*, nor again by the *Mbh*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and other different *Purāṇas* and *Upapurāṇas*, but also by several Jain and Buddhist canonical and non-cano-

123. Resp. Cal. 1934, and Cal. 1939.
124. Cal. 1934, Section XIV.
125. Poona, 1932.
126. London, 1927.
127. Calcutta, 1925.
128. Bonn, 1920.

nical works. The same problem, as narrowed down to the geographical description of India proper, was subsequently treated by Kirfel in a short monograph, *Bhāratavarṣa.*[129] Epic and Purāṇic accounts have been divided into three groups; shorter, longer, and *Mbh* and *Padma.* Texts in the longer group, however, are much earlier than the shorter group. Haraprasada Sastri in his preface to the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss at the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V,[130] takes an exhaustive critical survey of the *Rāmāyaṇa, Mbh* and the *Purāṇas.* He propounds many sound theories, and his observations will amply repay perusal. Regarding the *Mbh*, he gives a new meaning to *śloka*, taking it to convey a unit of 32 letters; and considers in detail the Parvasaṁgrahaparvan, the beginnings of the *Mbh*, the criteria for finding out interpolations and additions, language and philosophy, etc. With regard to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, he deals with the form of the work, its recensions, language, author, extent, editions, etc. Several problems such as the date of the *Purāṇas*, their number, authorship, criteria for ascertaining age, *māhātmyas*, etc. are considered in connection with the *Mahāpurāṇas.* Gonda's transliterated version of the Bhīṣmaparvan in Javanese deserves special mention.[131] Held makes an ethnological study of the *Mbh.*[132]

Two text-editions of the *Mbh* were published during this period. The Chitrashala Edition brings out the vulgate text with Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary: [133] it is simply a copy of an older edition " faithfully copying, in every detail, all the old mistakes and adding some of its own making, in the bargain ". Its only merit lies in its cheapness, which makes it easily accessible to the general public. Sufficient reference has already been made to Sastri's *Mahābhārata.*[134] Our complaint is that it is not what it purports to be, i. e., a critical edition of the S. recension. The work is carelessly done and the collations are inadequate. It is, however, valuable as it gives a continuous Southern text printed neatly in a handy volume for ready reference.

129. Stuttgart, 1931.
130. Calcutta, 1028.
131. Bandoung, 1936.
132. London, 1935.
133. Poona, 1929-1936.
134. Madras, 1931-1936. Reference may also be made to the number of vernacular translations of the *Mbh* that appeared during this period; there were translations in Marathi, Gujarati, Bengali, and Hindi.

§ 2 The Bhagavadgītā

The *Bhagavadgītā* has been accepted by the Hindus as the integral part of the *Mbh*, and some European scholars also endorse the view. The most important and significant events in connection with the *Bhg* studies during the last twenty-five years have been the publication of the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg*, and of the "original" *Gītā*. It is indeed curious how the *Bhg* presents such a relatively fixed consistent text without any noteworthy variation for the last 1200 years. The current text contains 700 stanzas, there being two other texts with 714 and 745 stanzas. The additional stanzas effect no material addition; nor do they create any difference in the teaching or add any new topic or argument.

F. Otto Schrader first brought to light the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg*,[135] which he maintains to be intrinsically superior to the Śaṁkara text, with its two commentaries dating from the 10th cent. The Kashmirian recension differs from the vulgate text of the *Bhg* not only in giving "fourteen complete and four half stanzas" not found in the current version, but also in presenting over 250 variant readings. Schrader also contributed papers on the subject, showing that the India Office Ms of the *Mbh*, though from Kashmir, no doubt, contained the vulgate text of the *Bhg*, but was not free from traces of Kashmirian recension; that Rāmakaṇṭha and Abhinavagupta were ignorant of the vulgate text; and that Śaṁkara's works and the vulgate *Bhg* came to Kashmir after the 11th cent.[136] He also points to a *Bhg* "riddle" which requires the assumption of the existence of a form of the *Bhg*, wherein Arjuna spoke only 57 (instead of 84) stanzas, and hence 27 of the present Arjuna stanzas are proposed to be excluded as later additions.[137] Since long, Belvalkar has made the *Bhg* study his own, and has to his credit many valuable contributions on the subject. The undertaking of the critical edition of the *Bhīṣmaparvan* has given him a thorough command of the Ms material of the *Bhg*, so that he can authoritatively pronounce about the text-problems. Belvalkar has, during the period under review, expressed his views exhaustively both in connection with the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg* and the original *Gītā*. He proposes to solve Schrader's riddle by including the *Gītāsāra* stanzas

135. Stuttgart, 1930.

136. "On the Form of the *Bhg* contained in the Kashmirian Mahābhārata," *JRAS*, 1935, pp. 146-149; "Rezensionen der Bhagavadgītā" *Fest. Winternitz* pp. 41-50.

137. "An Implication of the *Bhagavadgītā* Riddle," *NIA*, I, pp. 62-68.

in the *Bhg* proper, treating *Gītāsāra* as the *khila* of the *Bhg*, and by excluding certain stanzas from Arjuna and assigning these and some additional stanzas to Sañjaya, thus conforming to the *Gītāmāna* enumeration[138]. Belvalkar has examined the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg* in his new edition of the text[139], and he states that the comparison of this recension with the Śaṁkara text shows that in a number of passages the Kashmirian reading seeks (i) to regularise the grammar, (ii) to improve the syntax, and (iii) to improve the sense. According to the accepted canons of textual criticism the grammatically irregular readings preserved in the Śaṁkara text are likely to be the authentic ones and the Kashmirian text cannot claim to be intrinsically superior. Belvalkar also points out that there is no basis for the current view that Abul Fazl's Persian translation of the *Bhg* contained 745 stanzas. According to Belvalkar "it is legitimate to speak of a Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg* as it is legitimate in a smaller measure, to speak of a Rāmānujīya recension of the Poem" [140]. In a paper entitled "The Rāmānujīya text of the Bhagavadgītā" [141], Belvalkar has compared the Śaṁkara Gītāpāṭha with that followed by Rāmānuja on the evidence of the *Tātparyacandrikā*. He mentions thirty cases of differences of reading, of which only four being important are commented on by him. The only reading where Belvalkar thinks Rāmānuja's reading is definitely superior and authenticated by majority of reliable Mss is III. 2, where Rāmānuja reads *vyāmiśreṇa-eva* for *vyāmiśreṇa-iva* of Śaṁkara.

Coming to the different text-editions of the *Bhg* published during the last twenty-five years, we may mention that besides Schrader's edition, three other editions of the Kashmirian version have been published. Tadpatrikar brought out, in 1934, *Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā* with numerous variants from old Kashmirian Mss, an exhaustive introduction and critical notes, which has been published in the Pratinidhi Series (No. 1), under the patrohage of the Raja Saheb of Aundh. Here the Vulgate text has been given with variant readings from additional Kashmirian Mss. The Anandasrama published, in 1939, *Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā* with the comm. of

---

138. "*Bhagavadgītā* riddle unriddled," *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 335-348.

139. *Bhagavadgītā* with the comm. of Ānandavardhana. Poona, 1941; cf. also "The So-called Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgītā," *NIA*, II, pp. 211-251.

140. *Bhagavadgītā*, Introduction.

141. *Annals SVOI*, I, pp. 7-15,

Rājānaka Rāmakavi called Sarvatobhadra, also edited by Tadpatrikar. Four Mss from the B. O. R. I. were utilised for this edition, and it is found that Rāmakavi comments on a text of the *Bhg* which follows Kashmirian reading. The same text was published by the University of Madras in 1941 edited by T. R. Chintamani. This is based on five Mss, four from the B. O. R. I., and one from the India Office, three being in Nāgarī and two in Śāradā. There is also a scholarly introduction pointing out textual differences from the vulgate text noticed in the Kashmirian recension after comparing the texts adopted by different Kashmirian commentators. Schrader's views have been effectively refuted by appropriate extracts showing that Rāmakaṇṭha and Abhinavagupta knew the vulgate text as well as the *Gītā-Bhāṣya* by Śaṁkara. Chintamani regards Belvalkar's falling in line with the Otto-Garbe-Schrader suggestion about the interpolations in the *Bhg* as "unhappy" and shows that the so-called interpolated verses have been accepted as genuine by Śaṁkara, Rāmakaṇṭha and others.[142] Jivarama Kalidasa Sastri of Gondal published in 1935 the text of the *Bhg* purporting to be based on a Ms dated Saṁvat 1235 (=1179 A. D.), containing 21 additional stanzas and 250 variants. The Śuddhadharma Office, Madras, published in 1935, the text of the *Bhg*, having 745 stanzas divided into 26 chapters, with *pāda* index. English translation of the text has been published by T. M. Janardanam, and the editor believes that the *Bhg* contains an exposition of 24 Dharmas such as Nārāyaṇadharma, Avatāradharma, etc.; thus chs. 2-25 deal with 24 Dharmas in 4 *ṣaṭkas*. The Śuddhadharma text has been condemned by Schrader and others as "an artificial fabrication". Text of the *Bhg* with *Bhagavadgītārthaprakāśikā* of Śrī Upaniṣadbrahma was published from Adyar in 1941, edited by the Pundits of the Adyar Library. There is no reference to the Mss material utilised for the text. In his introduction, Kunhan Raja discusses the problem of the extent and nature of the text of the *Gītā*, which according to him is "an indivisible whole, a unit." Jivarama Kalidasa Sastri has recently published yet another text of the *Bhg* answering the *Gītāmāna* description of 745 stanzas. He describes the Ms to be palm-leaf dating from 1665 Saṁvat. The introduction deals exhaustively with the text-problem of the *Bhg*. Belvalkar very much doubts the genuineness of this "Bhojapatra *Gītā*", which he believes to have been manufactured quite recently to conform to the

142. *Bhagavadgītā*, Introduction.

Gītāmāna description in every particular.[143] Belvalkar has published an "authorised version" of the *Bhg*, with complete *pāda* index, in which he gives the Sāṁkara text.[144] He has brought out another edition of the *Bhg* (already referred to) with the *Jñānakarmasamuccayaṭīkā* of Ānandavardhana, with an introduction and two appendices. The introduction deals with the problem of the Kashmirian recension, to which we have already referred. Ānandavardhana belongs to 1680 A. D. Schrader's views have been refuted, and Belvalkar justifies his "mathematical operation" to which Chintamani objected. Appendix I gives a list of the names of works and authors cited by Ānandavardhana in his commentary, and Appendix II gives the variants in the two recensions in parallel columns. Among translations of the *Bhg*, reference may be made to those by Edgerton and Hill. "Song of the Blessed One" by Edgerton contains a clear and able anlysis of the contents of the *Bhg*.[145] According to Edgerton, "There is absolutely no documentary evidence that any other form of the *Gītā* than that we have was ever known in India". Hill's translation contains the vulgate text, an index, an argument and a commentary.[146] The introduction deals with the cult of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, composition and age of the *Bhg* (2nd cent. B. C. according to Hill), and the doctrine of the *Bhg*. There are bibliographical notes, Sanskrit Index and Subject Index to the *Bhg*.

Rudolf Otto published in 1934-35, three books on the Gītā dealing with the "Original Gītā".[147] The main purpose of these books is to propound a theory of the composition of the *Gītā*, according to which, hardly any of it belongs to the primitive text, and the contents consist mainly of tracts emanating from writers of different schools and foisted on to the original work. The scheme is elaborated with much ingenuity. Otto finds three distinct strata in the *Bhg*, one in the original poem consisting of 133 verses, another in the doctrinal tracts, and a third in the additions and glosses that came to be inserted later on. Belvalkar opposes Otto's contention, examines it critically, publishing the text as required

---

143. *Sahyādri* (in Marathi), 1942.

144. Poona, 1941.

145. Chicago, 1925.

146. Oxford. 1928

147. *Bhagavadgītā: Der Sang der Her-habenen.* Stuttgart, 1935; *Die Urgestalt der Bhagavadgītā.* Tübingen, 1934; *Die Lehrtraktate der Bhagavadgītā.* Tübingen, 1935; Eng. trans. *Original Bhagavadgītā—The Song of the Exalted One.* by J. E. Turner. London, 1939.

by Otto's theory, and concludes that the *Gītā* in its present form, though not a unitary poem, has been transformed into a philosophical synthesis and does not, therefore, admit of any stratification now.[148]

Turining now to the articles dealing with textual and interpretative aspects of the *Gītā*, we find that Charpentier's "Some Remarks on the Bhagavadgītā" [149] consider the views of different scholars about the original shape of the *Bhg*; give three stanzas from ch. ii, with English translation which appear old and original to the author; and place the earlier *Gītā* (ii-xi) somewhere about 200 B. C., and later (xii-xviii) after an interval of several centuries. Schrader thinks that *Bhg*. iii. 15 does not belong to the original *Gītā*, but is an interpolation. [150] The idea of Yajñacakra being older than the *Bhg*, he tries to explain it on the supposition that it is genuine. In "The Bhāgavatā Purāṇa and the Bhagavadgītā" [151] Raghavan investigates the question whether the author of the *Bhāgavata-P.* knew the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhg.* and concludes that he knew only the vulgate text of the *Bhg.* From the parallelisms in words and ideas culled from the *Bhg.* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Raghavan proves that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* used a text of the *Bhg* which was a mix up of the Kashmirian recension and the vulgats. [152] According to H. G. Narahari, [153] the Samādhilakṣaṇa forming part of the *Sūtasaṁhitā* of the *Skanda Purāṇa* is indebted to the *Bhg* for its contents, and many verses are obviously imitations of the statements contained in the *Bhg.* B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma has criticised Rajavade's article on the "Grammar of the *Gītā*" that it cannot be regarded as one of the best poems ot the world. [154] Gode has cited quotations from the *Bhg* in pre-Śaṁkara Jaina sourccs [155] like the *Padmapurāṇa*, *Śāstravārtāsamuccaya* and *Lokatattvanirṇaya*, in the hope that they may be helpful in clarification of the problem whether there existed different recensions of the *Gītā* before Śaṁkara.

---

148. " Miscarriage of Attempted Stratification of the Bhagavadgītā ", *JUB*, V, pp. 63-133.

149. *IA*, 1930, pp. 46-50; 77-80; 101-105; 121-126.

150. *IHQ*, V, pp. 173-181; 790-791.

151. *JOR*, XIII, pp. 71-72.

152. *JOR*, XIII, pp. 73-82; 161-163.

153. *ABORI*, XXI, pp. 100-105.

154. *ABORI*, XI, pp. 284-299; cf. also *R. G. Bhandarkar Comm. Vol*, pp. 325-38 (**Rajawade** : " Grammar of the Gītā.")

155. *ABORI*, XX, pp. 188-194.

Articles by Schrader and B. N. K. Sarma on ancient Gītā commentaries [156] refer to one Bhāskara, whom Sarma equates with a Vedāntin Bhāskara, a contemporary of Śaṁkara, aud Schrader with Bhāskara Bhaṭṭa, a Kashmirian Śaivite contemporary of Abhinavagupta.

D. S. Sarma points out, by quotations and comparisons, resemblances in ideas and expression between Upaniṣadic verses and the *Bhg*; and this is already recorded in *sarvopaniṣado gāvo* indicating *Upaniṣads* as "one of the sources of the *Bhg*". [157] A. N. Ray shows that Kṛṣṇa was the great religious teacher who brought about a Sāṁkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis, the harmonising of non-Brahmanical and Brahmanical philosophies. [158]

T. M. P. Mahadevan has tried to interpret the teaching of the Gītā consistently with the doctrine of non-violence in his " Is Gītā a Gospel of War?"[159] The same author in his *Two-fold Path in the Gītā*,[160] gives an elucidation of the main theme of Śaṁkara's view-point that the Gītā teaches two separate paths to two separate kinds of persons and does not advocate the combination of Jñāna and Karma simultaneously in one and the same person. *Musings on the Bhagavadgītā* [161] by Nehal Chand Vaish gives an exposition of the *Gītā* according to the author's own experience in life ; the reader is asked to appreciate the teaching of the Gītā according to his own experience in iife. V. G. Bhat's *The Bhagavadgītā : A Study* [162] deals with the Gītā in its relation to Hindu philosophy and religion, its position within the *Mbh*, etc., and tries to prove that it is mainly a harmonious work. Swami Suddhananda draws attention to work-lessness through work, doctrine of Karma Yoga, divine incarnation, resignation to divine will, etc., among "The Teachings of the Bhagavadgītā ".[163A] Reference is made to the conception of God in the *Bhg* and the method of His true worship which is said to be self-surrendering in the "Commonsense Religion in the Bhagavadgītā".[162B]

---

156. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 663-677 ; X, pp. 348-357 ; XI, pp. 188-196.
157. *JOR*, III, i.
158. " Śrīkṛṣṇa and the Source of the Bhagavadgītā," *IHQ*, IX, pp. 188-196.
159. *Phil. Qtly*, XVII, July 1941.
160. Madras, 1940.
161. Allahabad, 1931.
162. Dharwar, 1924.
163. A *Cult. Her.*, I, pp. 118-125.
163. B *Cult. Her.*, I, pp. 136-145.

K. M. Munshi deals with many aspects of the message of the Gītā in his "Experiential Approach to the Gītā".[164] Creative resistance, becoming, surrender to God, truth as *svadharma*, breaking the bonds, silence and solitude, are the various topics elaborately considered, well documented from the *Bhg* and the *Yogasūtras.* D. S. Sarma has made an intensive study of the *Bhg* and its philosophy, and has striven hard to make the *Gītā* popular among the younger generation. He propounds that eternal truth postulates immeasurable love and that truth is founded on the throne of love. Sarma's expositions in his " Lectures on the Bhagavadgītā "[165] which contain six lectures, an English translation and three appendices, are not only scholarly, but also lucid and simple. He has also brought out a Students' Edition of the *Bhagavadgītā.*[166] Sri Krishna Prem in his " Yoga of Bhagavadgītā, "[167] gives a practical insight into the prefect yoga of the *Gītā*, which according to the author is not an intellectual formation, but the mighty synthesis of the partial spheres of the different yogas integrating every aspect of the divine nature of all beings. P. Narasimham[168] makes the Gītā present his own philosophy of Brahman in which the life we owe to Brahman will not be something that needs escape and in which Mukti will not be for a select few only, but for the whole universe; besides, he deals with interpolations, characters in the epic, form of the epic, etc. Thadani's *Mystery of the Mahābhārata* is followed by the *Bhagavadgītā*[169] in which he holds that the *Gītā* is a logical step showing a progression of ideas from Sāṁkhya to Vedānta through Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Yoga, thus trying to correlate the diffsrent systems of philosophy and place them in a logical order. Finally, attention must be drawn to Kirfel's *Verse Index to Bhagavadgītā,*[170] which is an alphabetical pāda index of the *Gītā* based on the vulgate text, noting also the v. l. of the Anandasrama Ed and Schrader. Invaluable help of such tools to scholars can never be overestimated. An ambitious work dealing with the interpretations of the Bhagavadgītā, in several volumes, has been projected by S. C. Roy, of which Book I: *The Bhagavadgītā and Modern Scholarship* was published, from London, in 1941.

---

164. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, III, pp. 1-20.
165. Rajahmundry, 1937.
166. Madras, 1930.
167. London, 1938.
168. *Gītā ; A Critique.* Madras, 1939.
169. Karachi, 1936.
170. Leipzig, 1938.

Before dealing with the other epic, there are some articles referring to both the *Mbh* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Hopkins has referred to the allusions to the Rāma story in the *Mbh* [171], and has given 62 references in all; there are 17 in the *Āraṇyaka* and 14 in the *Droṇa*, while in 6 Parvans there is no reference at all; relevant passages have been given. Ruben has given parallel phrases in the *Rām* and *Mbh* in App. V of his text[172]. In a chapter entitled "Princes and Peoples of the Epic Poems"[173] Hopkins mentions the features common to the *Rām* and *Mbh* referring to the metre, tales, genealogies, phraseology, etc.; he has also pointed out the differences in the two epics, characters figuring in which he takes to be partly historical and partly mythical. H. C. Ray Chaudhury considers the views of Hopkins and Macdonell about the relation of the two epics.[174] V. Narayana Aiyar by quotations from the Nalopākhyāna of the *Mbh* and Sundarakāṇḍa of the *Rām* draws attention to the astonishing similarity in thought and language of the two works[175]. The same topic has received full, critical and comprehensive treatment at the hands of Sukthankar, where after considering the previous writers on the subject, and after subjecting the texts to a searching analysis, the author concludes that our *Rām* text was used as a "source" by the diaskeuasts of the *Mbh*, and that the *Rām* was composed in the interval which separated the *Bhārata* from the *Mbh*. [176] "Rāmopākhyāna and Rāmāyaṇa" [177] by Sukthankar finds support for Jacobi's view (that the Rāmopā. was based on the *Rām*), and gives a concordance of parallel passages in the *Mbh* and *Rām* numbering 82, which proves, contrary to Hopkins, that the Rāmopākhyāna is an epitome of our *Rām*. Incidentally it is shown how precarious are the conclusions based on the vulgate text of the *Mbh*. N. N. Ghose makes a detailed sociological study of the *Rām* and the *Mbh*, in which he states that in the Bhāratavarṣa of the epics there was no trace of self government.[178] The Kurukṣetra war has been historically interpreted as the struggle between orthodoxy and dissent, the conservative and the radical, in which for the moment the conservative and the

---

171. *JAOS*, 50, pp. 85-103.
172. *Studien zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa*, Stuttgart, 1936.
173. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, pp. 251-276.
174. *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 25-34.
175. *JOR*, XI, i.
176. "The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa", *Festschrift Thomas*, pp.294-303.
177. *Festschrift Kane*, pp. 472-487.
178. Asutosh Silver Jubilee Vol. Orientalia III. 2., pp. 361-404.

orthodox, the sanātanavarṇāśramadharma prevailed, leading to the establishment of Brāhmaṇa rule. P. C. Mullick in his *Mahābhārata as a History and a Drama* divides the *Rām* also into two parts, the first ending with the death of Rāvaṇa and the accession of Bibhīṣaṇa, and the second with the death and disappearance of Rāmcandra and his brothers.

§ 3. The Rāmāyaṇa

The problems connected with the critical text of the *Rām* have been dealt with by Ruben.[179] He observes that the relations of Mss materials of the Rām are in many respects similar to those of the *Mbh*, so that it is not a wrong procedure to follow Sukthankar's method in the classification of Mss very closely. Schemes of recensions and principles of text history are the same in both epics. Like the *Mbh*, the *Rām* Mss are divided into two recensions, N. and S., each of which is again subdivided into two versions. The N. recension comprises the N.-W. and the N.-E. versions, and the S. recension comprises the version of the Amṛtakatakaṭīkā and the version of the commentary of Rāmānuja. It may be noted that unlike the *Mbh*, this grouping of the versions is regional in one case, and based on commentaries in the other. Kṣemendra is as important a testimonium for the *Rām* as he is for the *Mbh*. Vimalabodha and Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, common commentators on the *Rām* and *Mbh*, appear to belong to N.-E. Ruben has given a list of 61 Mss in all, including Mss in catalogues, as also those referred to in the printed editions and also those of the commentaries. He gives specimens of critical texts of the *Rām* in parallel columns similar to Kirfel, together with variants from a number of Mss. Four different continuous texts have been given from different parts of the text. One Appendix deals with " Sūta ".

Raghu Vira of the International Academy of Indian Culture of Lahore has undertaken to edit a critical text of the *Rām* on lines similar to those of the critical edition of the *Mbh*. He seems to have followed the lead given by Ruben in his book. A trial fascicule has been published giving text of the different versions in three parallel columns (of which the left hand column is curiously almost invariably blank) with variants in the footnotes, but without either an introduction or even a bare description of the critical apparatus and the interrelationship between the various recensions of the epic. There is a bare list of 30 Mss with only their benedic-

179. *Studien zur textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa*, Stuttgart, 1936.

tory portions. The first fascicule contains the first six cantos of the Ādikāṇḍa.[180]

Almost simultaneously with the B. O. R. I. Edition of the *Mbh*, the authorities of the D. A. V. College, Lahore, began their critical edition of the N.-W. recension of the *Rām.* Sukthankar's view that such critical editions of different versions or recensions contain much secondary matter and readings which are hard to detect unless the evidence of *all extant Mss belonging to different recensions and versions* is taken into account, applies in this case also. About 200 codices of the different Kāṇḍas of the *Rām* were secured from N.-W. India, of which only about a dozen Mss were finally utilised in this edition. The *Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa* edited by Ram Labhaya was published in 1928, and Bhagavad Datt brought out the *Bāla Kāṇḍa* in 1931. Later on Vishva Bandhu Sastri took charge and released *Araṇya Kāṇḍa* in 1935, followed by *Kiṣkindhā* the next year. In reviewing the last publication,[181] De expressed doubt whether all Mss belonged to N.-W., and drew attention to the fact that some Mss were misch-codices and no attempt was made to evaluate them. De also pointed out that the edition was frankly eclectic, but on no recognizable critical principles and there was no attempt to make a comparative study of this recension with the S. and Bengal recensions. The *Sundara Kāṇḍa* published in 1940, edited by Vishva Bandhu Sastri, in view of De's criticism, contains useful introductory matter giving detailed text-critical introduction describing the basic Mss and giving their comparative valuation. According to the Editor, all the 10 Mss on which the edition is based, represent a unitary version, but the question how far it is a uniform, non-conflate version, is not evident from the present edition.

R. Narayanaswami Aiyar [182] has published the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, S. recension, under an editorial committee consisting of Kuppuswami Sastri and others, which purports to have been based on collation of a number of printed editions and several Mss including 3 Grantha and 1 Nāgarī. Characteristic features of none of the Mss are given, and the variants noted are very few in number. The book is artistically got up, neatly printed, and very useful for ready reference.

---

180. Lahore, July 1938, pp. 1-36.
181. *OLD*, II, pp. 207-208.
182. Madras, 1933.

After text-editions we turn to different works on the *Rām*. *Rāmāyaṇa Samālocanā* (in Marathi) by "Mahārāṣṭrīya",[183] in its first part containing 7 chapters, deals with several important points relating to the *Rām*, such as the excellence of the epic, the ideal character of Rāma, social, political, and economic conditions of those days, nature and degree of the civilisation of the Vānaras and Rākṣasas, interpolations, etc. The second part, with 11 chapters, has learned discussions on the chronology of the *Rām*, determination of geographical place mentioned in the *Rām* where the author identifies Laṅkā with Ceylon, analysis of important characters in the epic, and critical review of some other versions of the Rāma story in the *Ānanda Rām*, *Adhyātma Rām*, *Tulasī Rām*, etc. One Appendix enumerates 90 Sanskit *Rāmāyaṇas*. The foreword by J. S. Karandikar gives in a nutshell the important features and conclusions of the topics discussed by the author. D. C. Sen in the *Bengali Rāmāyaṇas*[184] states that the Vālmīki Rām has been welded together from materials taken from (i) the Daśaratha Jātaka, (ii) cycle of legends from southern India that grew up about a grand and noble Brāhmaṇa hero, Rāvaṇa, and (iii) the floating group of legends related to apc-worship. As regards the development of the Rāma saga in Bengal, Sen says that none of the Bengal *Rāmāyaṇas* are translations of the Sanskrit epic, but each auther tells his story in his own way weaving into it his own thoughts and ancient traditions current in the neighbourhood. After the Vaiṣṇava revival of Caitanya, later writers filled their poems with Vaiṣṇava doctrines and with theories about Bhakti. *Beowulf and the Ramayana* by I. S. Peter[185] is a study in comparative literature on epic poetry, Indian and Anglo-Saxon. Epic construction, political and social conditions of the epic age, epic philosophy, and common characteristics of heroic poetry, have been dealt with in the book. C. Narayana Menon in *An Approach to the Rāmāyaṇa*[186] a small booklet covering about 30 pages, regards that the *Rām* represents a synthesis of the cults and cultures prevalent in different parts of India. The author takes the eternal present as the subject matter of literature and therefore is somewhat critical about the discoveries by literary and archaeological means. The surrender of the will of the reader to Rāma is essential, and when Rāma who integrates all life is realised men cannot fight among themselves any more than

---

183. Poona, 1927.
184. Calcutta, 1920.
185. London, 1924.
186. Benares, 1942.

branches of the same tree can stifle each other. *The Rāmāyaṇa Polity*[187] represents the Doctorate thesis of P. C. Dharma, the object of the authoress in writing the thesis being to depict the political institutions as described by Vālmīki in the *Rām.* The polity is considered in its different aspects and the conclusion is that "the system of administration during the *Rāmāyaṇa* period was far from rudimentary and anticipated very much that of the later poriods." There is a short bibliography at the end. T. Paramasiva Iyer in his *Rāmāyaṇa and Laṅkā* [188] with the aid of the *Rām* and the Survey of India standard sheets, locates Laṅkā in the C. P. near Jubbulpore. The author feels that the *Rām* was in substance a credible record of the struggle of the Aryans and the Gonds for Janasthāna, the populous, fertile, black-soiled, high level plain of the Damoh district. According to the author, Ceylon cannot be the Laṅkā of the *Rām.* Maps in the book facilitate reference. M. Venkatesa Iyengar has appreciated the best parts of the *Rām* in his "Poetry of Vālmīki".[189] Among the topics dealt with by the author are the origin of the *Rām*, later additions to the poem, the story of the six books, etc. From Lahore comes the English translation of *Rāmāyaṇa in China* by Chikyo Yamamoto.[190] The first is the *Jātaka* of an unnamed king which was translated into the Chinese from an original Indian text by Kang-Seng Hui in 251 A. D.; and the second, Nidana of king "Ten Luxuries", which was translated into Chinese from an original Indian text by Kekaya in 472 A. D. *Przyczynki do Badan Nad Dziejami Redakcyj Rāmāyaṇy* (in Polish) by Eugeniusz Sluszkiewicz[191] gives similar passages in parallel columns from the different recensions of the Rāma story. *Rāmopākhyāna* and the *Rām*, *Rāvaṇavadha* and the *Rām*, and the *Jānakīharaṇa* and the *Rām* are the recensions considered. The arrangement seems rather complicated and confusing. From his different texts it is difficult to estimate the actual range and extent of the similarities. The author holds that at the time of the *Rāmopākhyāna*, the *Rām* was known in two slightly different forms, and that the

187. Madras, 1942. The same authoress has also contributed a number of articles dealing with different aspects of Rāmāyaṇa culture to various oriental journals such as *ABORI*, *PO*, *QJMS*, *IC*, *JIH*, etc. Unfortunitely, I coould not take a note of these articles as I was under the impression that all of them have appeared in book form.

188. Bangalore, 1940.
189. Bangalore, 1940.
190. Lahore, 1938.
191. Krakow, 1938.

recension of Lahore could not have constituted the source of the *Rāmopākhyāna.*

In turning to the articles on the *Rām*, we consider first those dealing with texts and text-criticism, recensions of the *Rām*, and its influence. In the "Original Rāmāyaṇa",[192] Hopkins contends, from a study of the N.-W. recension of the *Rām*, that the view that the *Ādi Rām* referred to in some Marathi works has been the original of the several recensions is wrong, and that the texts have been handed down by word of mouth, the oral version being reduced to writing at a later period according to local authorities. On the basis of the findings of D. C. Sen, J. Kats[193] tries to find out the relationship between the chief characters in the *Rām* as current in Java and Sumatra. M. Ghosh[194] concludes that the old Javanese *Rām* Kakawin was partially a translation and partially an adaptation of the Bhaṭṭikāvya. In the "Rāmāyaṇa in Greater India" K. A. Nilakanta Sastri[195] draws attention to the influence of the *Rām* not only in Java and Bali but in Cambodia, Loas, Siam and other parts of Indo-China and China proper. The entire *Rām*, as we have it, including the *Uttarakāṇḍa* is shown to have been known in Champa in the 7th century A. D. F. W. Thomas refers to the four fragments of the Tibetan *Rāmāyaṇa*,[196] which do not closely correspond to the Indian version of the *Rām*; the incidents and the nomenclature differ widely. They contain a highly peculiar Rāma story. It appears that popular Rāma narratives differing from the classical version of Vālmīki were current very early, and they may have reached China through Nepal.

The origin and growth of the "Jaina Rāmāyāṇas" have been studied, starting from the Vālmīki *Rām*[197]. The two Jaina schools, viz. the Vimalasūri and Guṇabhadra, differ widely from one another; one follows Vālmīki and the other is influenced by parts of Buddhist *Rām.* N. Aiyaswami Sastri refers to the stories of Yayāti, Śibi, Alarka, Jāmadagnya, etc., in his "References to Ancient Stories in the Rāmāyaṇa"[198], and concludes that it is impossible to draw on this score a clear line of demarcation between the styles of the *Rām*

192. *JAOS*, Sept. 1926.
193. *BSOS*, v. iii.
194. *JGIS*, III. i.
195. *JOR*, VI. pp. 113–120.
196. *Festschrift Lanman*, pp. 193–212.
197. **Narasimhachara,** *IHQ*, XV, pp. 575–594.
198. *JOR*, V. pp. 101–107.

and *Buddhacarita* as suggested by K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer. M. V. Kibe[199] regards the *Uttarakāṇḍa* as a necessary portion of the *Rām*, and as containing facts that are corroborated by archaeological excavations ; hence it cannot be an interpolation. Rāya Kṛṣṇadāsa[200] tries to show that the *Rām* had vast contact with the Bhṛgus and that Kāvya denotes descendant of Kavi, of Bhṛgu.

Then we come to articles containing literary and critical appreciation of the *Rām*. B. V. Kamesvara Aiyar gives the views of Sanskritists in Europe and America about (i) the historicity and interpretation of the events in the *Rām*, (ii) date of composition, and (iii) later additions and interpolations in the *Rām*[201]. That Aśvaghoṣa was greatly influenced by the Kāvya style of the *Rām* is the conclusion of G. W. Gurner in "Aśvaghoṣa and the Rāmāyaṇa" [202]. The same writer has pointed out passages from the *Rām* containing descriptions of seasons to show that they have immensely influenced the descriptions of seasons by later writers[203]. In his "Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa", K.A.Subrahmanya Iyer makes an intelligent survey of the similes and metaphors of the *Rām*, and analyses Vālmīki's imagery, which shows that imagery comes forth more spontaneously and in greater abundance in descriptions of nature and in speeches made by different characters when under the stress of some emotion.[204]

Identification of Laṅkā has occupied several scholars. M. V. Kibe,[205] in a number of contributions, seeks to establish that Laṅkā is located in Central India near Amarkantak. Hira Lal[206] also supports the same view, and so does J. C. Ghosh,[207] who shows that in ancient times there existed in the border of Madhyadeśa a region called Laṅkā. Daniel John[208] and V. R. R. Dikshitar[209] hold Ceylon to be Laṅkā ; and D. R. Bhandarkar,[210] as against the Central India theory, states that Daṇḍakāraṇya means Mahārāṣṭra. V. H. Vader[211]

199. *JIH*, XX, i.
200. *NPP*, 1998. pp. 1-18.
201. *QJMS*, XVI, pp. 240-252.
202. *JASB*, XXIII, iii.
203. *JASB*, XXVI. i.
204. *JOR*, III, iv.; IV ; V, pp. 147-155.
205. *IHQ*, IV, pp. 693-702 ; *ABORI*, XVII, pp. 321-384 ; XXII, pp. 123-127.
206. *Jha, Comm. Vol.* pp. 151-161.
207. *ABORI*, XIX, pp. 84-86.
208. *ABORI*, XXI, pp. 270-279.
209. *IC*, I, pp. 579-585 ; *Proc. Or. Conf.*, VII, pp. 243-252.
210. *Jha Comm. Vol.* pp. 47-57.
211. *IHQ*, II, pp. 345-350.

locates Laṅkā on the equator, stating the present Maladivas to be the Rākṣasadvīpa. D. P. Misra places Laṅkā on that portion of the Bay of Bengal which washes the shores of the northern part of the present Āndhra country.[212] Parallel to the identifications of Laṅkā, have been the identifications of Vānaras and Rākṣasas by different scholars. Kibe[213] and Hira Lal[214] take them to be inhabitants of the country round Amarkantak; Gondas are stated to be the cultural descendants of Rāvaṇa. G. Ramdas[215] identifies the Śabaras, Rākṣasas and Niṣādas of the *Rām* with the Mundaris. Chintaharan Chakravarti[216] shows that beastly behaviour and appearance have wrongly been attributed to Hanūman, Sugrīva, Rāvaṇa and others in Hindu mythological works. T. K. Venkataraman suggests that the " Rākṣasas"[217] may be Asuras. K. S. Ramaswami Sastri takes the colonies of Kiṣkindhā and Laṅkā to be Aryan.[218]

In " Rāma und Śambūka ",[219] Wilhelm Printz opposes Weber's theory that the Śambūka episode of the *Rām* refers to the settlement of the Christian missionaries on the Coast of Coromandel, and traces development of this episode in the *Padmapurāṇa*, *Mbh*, *Raghuvaṁśa*, *Uttararāmacarita* and *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*. " Evolution of the Myth of Ahalyā Maitreyī"[220] is dealt with by Dhirendra Varma, who shows that the Ahalyā legend is not historical, but is based on mythology or religious allegory. It begins with Indra and ultimately merges into the greatness of Rāma, serving as a fine specimen showing how it has been adapted by devotees of Viṣṇu to serve their own purpose.

Finally, in his paper on the " Culture of the Rāmāyaṇa,[221] Swami Niḥśreyasānanda gives some aspects of the culture and writes on some important characters that figure in the epic. P. P. S. Sastri relies on tradition and maintains that " Vālmīki composed his *Rām* in seven books of 24000 stanzas ".[222]

212. *Mahakosala Hist. Society's Papers*, Vol. I.
213. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 144–145.
214. *Jha Comm. Vol.* pp. 151–161.
215. *JBORS*, XI; also *IHQ*, V, pp. 281–299; VI, pp. 284–289; 544–548; etc.
216. *IHQ*, I, pp. 779–781.
217. *Rangaswami Comm. Vol.* pp. 187–190.
218. *IC*, V, pp. 193–196.
219. *ZII*, V, iii..
220. *Jha Comm. Vol.* pp. 427–433.
221. *Cult. Her.*, I, pp. 77–97.
222. *Krishnaswamy Aiyangar Comm. Vol.* pp. 321–323.

§ 4. The Purāṇas

Ever since Wilson made pioneer attempts in the cause of the *Purāṇas*, Pargiter was the only European scholar who made a critical and serious study of the *Purāṇas*, drawing attention of scholars to the historical importance of the *Purāṇas*. Besides his valuable book, "Ancient Indian Historical Tradition",[223] Pargiter has contributed some papers on ancient genealogies. Pargiter makes a careful study of the texts of the *Purāṇas* to extract and reconstruct history from them from the earliest times down to the Bhārata war in his *Anc. Ind. Hist. Trad.* He distinguishes between Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya tradition, treats the latter as more trustworthy, and includes the *Purāṇas* and the epics under it. Pargiter also holds that the Purāṇic tradition does not support the theory of the Aryan immigration through the N. W. Frontier, and takes the Mānavas to belong to the Dravidian stock. It is impossible to do even a partial justice to Pargiter's treatise here. Pargiter's views and theories have been subsequently criticised piecemeal; Munshi objects to the definite Ksatriya bias of Pargiter and states that Vedic corrective is required to test the trustworthiness of the *Purāṇic* traditions;[224] Dutt[225] and Ghurye[226] express contrary opinions regarding the Himalayan origin and the three racial stocks propounded by Pargiter; Dikshitar[227] criticises the so-called Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya tradition theory and other views; the present writer[228] has tried to prove that the *Purāṇas* were not originally in Prakrit as held by Pargiter; Rapson[229] and Winternitz[230] also criticise some particulars in Pargiter's book. Another valuable contribution to *Purāṇic* studies is Kirfel's *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*.[231] The author divides the texts of the *Purāṇas* into three different groups, and gives relavant extracts from each group under the five topics constituting the characteristic features of the *Purāṇas*. Footnotes

223. Oxford, 1922; also, Ancient India Genealogies, *Bhandarkar Comm. Vol.* pp. 107-113; Viśvāmitra, Vasiṣṭha, Hariścandra and Śunaḥśepa, *JRAS*. 1917, pp. 39-67; etc.
224. *Early Aryans in Gujerat*, Bombay, 1941, Lecture I.
225. *Aryanisation of India*, Culcutta, 1925, pp. 140 ff.
226. *Proc. Or. Conf.*, IX, pp. 911-954 (Pres. Add.).
227. "*Purāṇas*—A Study", *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 747-767.
228. "Were the *Purāṇas* originally in Prakrit?—read at Hyderabad Conference; to be published in *Dhruva Comm. Vol.*
229. *Cam. Hist. of India*, Vol. I, pp. 296-318.
230. *Hist. Ind. Lit*, I, pp. 519, 521, 523, 524 (notes) etc.
231. Bonn, 1927.

give exact references to each stanza of the text and variations and divergent texts have been given in parallel columns. Meyer's *Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa*[232] is a detailed criticism of Losch's work on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, where he tried to prove that the *Smṛti* has been pieced together from fragments taken out of the *Purāṇas*. Meyer proves that the *Smṛti* was the source of the *Purāṇa* passages. R. C. Hazra, who has already contributed a number of articles on different *Purāṇas* in various Oriental journals, has recently published a valuable work entitled *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*,[233] where he has subjected the *Purāṇas* to a sifting critical analysis from the ritualistic point of view. The first part fixes the chronology of *Purāṇic* chapters dealing with Hindu rites and customs showing two stages, and the second part deals with pre-*Purāṇic* and *Purānic* Hindu society. The appendices refer to the verses quoted from the *Purāṇas* in the *Smṛti* works and to untraceable *Purāṇic* verses. *Purāṇa-Praveśa* (in Bengali)[234] by G. C. Bose and *Purāṇa-Vivecana* (in Gujarati)[235] by Durgashanker Shastri deal with various aspects of the *Purāṇas*, giving an analysis of each *Purāṇa*, and study the chronology of the *Purāṇas* and their relation with Sanskrit literature, etc. Y. V. Kolhatkar treats mainly the different problems connected with the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, its religion and philosophy, etc., in his *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatādarśa* (in Marathi).[236] V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar writes about the Flood legends in the *Purāṇas*, polity in the *Matsya Purāṇa*, architecture, Tamil version of the *Matsya*, etc., in his *Matsya Purāṇa, A Study.*[237] The same scholar's *Some Aspects of the Vāyu Purāṇa*[238] refers to the cosmogony, historical portions, philosophy, music, etc., of the *Vāyupurāṇa*, as also to the literature known to the author of the *Vāyupurāṇa*, etc. H. C. Ray Chaudhury in his *Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect*,[239] has collected and discussed statements, references and allusions

---

232. Breslau, 1929.

233. Dacca. 1940. **Hazra** has already published a number of papers on individual *Purāṇas* in various Oriental journals; but in view of this book, wherein practically all his previous writings have been incorpotated, no separate reference to the articles was deemed necessary.

234. Calcutta, 1934.

235. Ahmedabad, 1931.

236. Poona, 1921.

237. Madras, 1935.

238. Madras, 1933.

239. Calcutta, 1920.

from early literature to throw light on the Kṛṣṇa problem and the growth of Bhāgavatism. He discredits the views that Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva was a solar deity, or a tribal god or a vegetation deity, and treats Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva as one person, indentical with Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. Har Dutt Sarma in his *Padma-Purāṇa and Kālidāsa*[239A] shows that the *Padmapurāṇa* was the source of Kālidāsa's *Śākuntala* and *Raghuvaṃśa*. E. Rose[239B] and H. Meinhard [239C] have dealt with Śaivism in the *Purāṇas*. Rose has given some texts of the thousand names of Śiva J. Meier[239D] treats of the grammatical archaisms in the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. Vincent Smith, D. R. Bhandarkar, K. P. Jayaswal, H. C. Ray Chaudhury, S. N. Pradhan, V. Rangacharya and others in their treatises on the early history of India refer to the *Purāṇas* as affording one of the sources for chronology and history. V. R. Ramswami Sastrulu and Sons of Madras have brought out, what they call a critical and scientific edition of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in three volumes; but the Mss are not described, variants only occasionally noted but their sources are not indicated; and hence the claim of a critical edition cannot be justified. It is however a very handy and useful edition of the text.

Coming to the individual articles, it is to be observed that there are a number of articles dealing with the *Purāṇas* in general which give a bird's eye view of the whole problem. H. P. Sastri's Mahāpurāṇas[240] contains an amplified version of his preface to the Catalogue of Mss. Dikshitar's *Purāṇas, A Study*,[241] is a well-documented article considering critically the views of earlier scholars on the subject and is well-worth perusal. Venkatachella Iyer [242] refers to Pargiter with approval and maintains that some of the major *Purāṇas* were rewritten with the set purpose of promoting ignorance and superstition! In his "Origin and Character of Purāṇa Literature," B. C. Muzumdar[243] states that the *Purāṇa* as a branch of sacred literature did exist in the Vedic days, that for each Vedic school a separate *Purāṇa* was organised, and that the modern

239 A. Calcutta, 1925.

239 B. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des śivaitschen Namenglaubens nach den Purāṇen* Bonn, 1934.

239 C. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Śaivismus nach den Purāṇas*. Berlin, 1928.

239 D. *Der Archaismus in der Sprache des Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. Leipzig, 1931.

240. *JBORS*, XIV pp. 323-340.

241. *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 747-767.

242. *QJMS*, XIII, pp. 702-713.

243. *Asutosh Sil. Jub. Comm. Vol.* Orientalia, III. 2, pp. 7-30.

Purāṇas received only a little additional matter by way of accretion from fifth century onwards, though the modern *Purāṇas* differ radically from the Vedic *Purāṇas*. The origin and history of the worship of phallus, Durgā and Śiva in the *Mbh* and *Purāṇas* is also considered. E. J. Rapson has a chapter on the *Purāṇas* in his *Cambridge History of India*,[244] where he regards the *Purāṇas* as of Kṣatriya origin and the genealogies as partly legendary and partly historical, it being necessary to disentangle history from legend by removing all accretions from the *Purāṇas*. Hazra has written about the age and origin of the *Upa-purāṇas* whose formation he places between 650–800 A. D.[245]

There are a number of articles dealing with the historical importance of the *Purāṇas*[246] as also with history in the *Purāṇas* and the application of the test of the *Purāṇa* for interpreting history. I shall content myself only with referring to the important papers of the latter class. K. P. Jayaswal proves that the word Yaunaḥ mentioned in the *Vāyupurāṇa* represents the Kuṣaṇa title Jauna.[247] A. S. Altekar [248] reconstructs pre-Bhārata war history from the *Purāṇas*, stating that the pre-Bhārata dynasties in the *Purāṇas* are as historical as the Mauryas of later times. K. M. Munshi narrates the historical events from Rāma Jāmadagneya to Janamejaya Pārikṣita on the basis of Vedic and Purāṇic data.[249] S. B. Chaudhury has tried to show that the original traditions of all Purāṇic stories were current contemporaneously with the Vedic legends.[250] K. H. Dhruva's " Historical Contents of the Yugapurāṇa ", which forms part of the *Garga Saṁhitā*, throws a good deal of light on the ancient history of India.[251] H. C. Seth interprets the *Purāṇas* to suit his peculiar theory of the Mauryas.[252] Narayana Tripathi

244. Chap. XIII, pp. 296–316; **Winternitz** (*Hist. Ind. Lit.*, I, pp. 517–586) also has a valuable chapter wherein besides a short analysis of each of the Mahā-Purāṇas, are given views of westerners about Purāṇic religion and philosophy, etc. with the author's masterly comments.

245. *ABORI*, XXI, pp. 38–62.

246. Bhimashankar **Rao**, *JAHRS*, II, pp. 81–90; **Dikshitar**, *PO*, III, pp. 77–83; **Divanji**, *JGRS*, Bhagvanlal Indraji Cent. No., pp. 102 ff.

247. *JBORS*, XVIII, ii.

248. *JBHU*, IV, pp. 183–229.

249. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, I, pp. 144–155.

250. *JIH*, III, pp. 1–17.

251. *JBORS*, XVI, pp. 18–66.

252. *Kane Festschrift*, pp. 420–422; *JBORS*, XVIII; JUPHS, 1940.

considers "Purāṇic Traditions".[253] which show India as the early home of the Aryans from where they migrated in all directions at different periods; divisions of the world also have been given. S. K. Chatterji pleads for the recognition of the *Jātaka* as a repository of *Purāṇas* containing old traditions and hence to be seriously taken along with Brahmanic *Purāṇas* and epics.[254] In another article, he shows that Purāṇic stories have a pre-Aryan substratum in Prakrit originals, and considers the evolution of the Kṛṣṇa legend in Bengal.[255] Jwala Prasad Singhal takes the great flood as the first great landmark in Purāṇic history, considers Punjab as the home of the Aryans, and compares the information collected from the *Purāṇas* with Western historians.[256] G. Harihara Sastri draws attention to the "Purāṇic genealogies in the Avantisundarī-kathā",[257] which refer to the chronology of Kaliyuga dnyasties beginning with Pradyota. Gulshan Ray gives a connected political history of India from 7350-3000 B. C. on the information supplied by the *Purāṇas*;[258] according to the author, corroborated statements in the *Purāṇas* should be accepted as trustworthy. The present writer has tried to show that Ṛgvedic Kuruśravaṇa may be identified with Purāṇic Kuru-Saṁvaraṇa.[259]

Identifications of the seven and (or) nine great islands of the earth according to the *Purāṇas* give rise to some articles in this section.[260] "Topography in the Purāṇas" forms the subject of two articles by S. B. Chaudhury, dealing with Purusottamakṣetra[261] and Veṅkaṭācala.[262] Topographical information contained in the *Agni*[263] and *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas*[264] has been alphabetically given by H. V. Trivedi, who also writes about Hemakūṭa.[265] Binayak Misra deals with "folk-lore and Pauranic traditions about the origin of God

253. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 461-469; 880-885; X, pp. 121-124.
254. *Woolner Comm. Vol.* pp. 34-40.
255. *BSOS*, VIII, pp. 457-466.
256. *IHQ*, III, pp. 25-47.
257. *Rangaswami Comm. Vol.* pp. 351-358.
258. *Ind. Hist. Congress*, Lahore, pp. 101-116.
259. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pp. 72-76.
260. **S. B. Chaudhury**, *IA*, 59, pp. 204-208; 224-226; V. V. Venkatachella **Iyer**, *QJMS*, XV, pp. 62-75; 119-127; 238-245; XVI, pp. 116-124; 268-283; XVII, pp. 30-45; 94-105; K. A. Nilakanta **Sastri**, *JIH*, Sp. No, pp. 61-64.
261. *IHQ*, V, pp. 659-665.
262. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 245-253.
263. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 470-478.
264. *IHQ*, X, pp. 642-664.
265. *IHQ*, XII, pp. 534-540.

Jagannātha," [266] disentangling historical facts clouded by legends and mythology with the help of archaeological data. V. S. Agrawala identifies Nāgadvīpa with Nicobar. [267] Pātāla has been identified with Central America by H. R. Mankad, [268] and O. C. Gangoly conjetures that Borneo may have been the Barhiṇadvīpa of the *Parāṇas*.[269] In his note on the "Vastrāpatha-māhātmya of the Skandapurāṇa," H. C. Ray Chaudhury shows that the king Bhoja who reigned at Kanoja was supreme over Surāṣṭra and abdicated in favour of his son. [270],

Then we turn to articles on individual *Purāṇas*. There have been quite a number of articles on the date of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, different scholars like C. V. Vaidya [271] (10th century A. D.) B. N. Krishnamurty Sarma [272] (prior to 6th century) A. N. Ray [273] (550-650 A. D.) and Durgashanker Sastri [274] (not before 8th century.), assigning it to different periods basing their conclusions on literary data. Gode draws attention to an illustrated Ms of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* copied in 1648 A. D. [275] Ray points to I.3 , VI. 8 and XII. 1 in the Bangawasi edition as interpolations in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* [276] and takes the author of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* to be a native of the Tamil country; [277] he further shows that the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* has borrowed words and ideas from the *Gauḍapādakārikās*. [278] S. Srikantha Sastri tries to prove that the *Devībhāgavata* which can be assigned to the 6th century is slightly earlier than *Śrīmadbhāgavata*. [279] According to Ganganath Jha the description in the *Śivapurāṇa* (372. i. 129) is more applicable to the *Devībhāgavata*. [280] S. B. Chaudhury gives an analysis of the *Agnipurāṇa* and places its compilation between the middle of the eighth to the middle of the ninth century A. D. [281]

266. *IHQ*, XIII, pp. 600-609.
267. *JBORS*, XXIII, i.
268. *PO*, *II*, ii.
269. *JGIS*, III, i
270. *IHQ*, V, pp. 129-133.
271. *JBBRAS*, I.
272. *ABORI*, XIV, pp. 182-218.
273. *JAssamRS*, II, iii.
274. *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pp. 129-139.
275. *NIA*, I, pp. 249-253.
276. *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 253-256.
277. *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 49-53. C. V. Vaidya also takes the author of the *Bhāgavata-P.* to have lived in the Dravida country.
278. *BSOS*, VII, pp. 107-111.
279. *ABORI*, XIV, pp. 241-249.
280. *Kuppuswami Comm. Vol*, pp. 1-2.
281. *JAHRS*, III, pp. 127-134.

P. C. Lahiri [282] and Raghavan [283] write about Rīti and Guṇa in the *Agnipurāṇa*; and Meyer [284] about "Tree-culture in the *Agni*" giving the Sanskrit text. S. K. De assigns the Alaṁkāra portion of the *Agnipurāṇa* to the beginning of the ninth century A. D.[285] S. B. Chaudhury has shown that the *Vāyupurāṇa* is the genuine Mahāpurāṇa[286], and the present writer also has arrived at the same conclusion after a fresh consideration of the problem[287]. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri draws attention particularly to two passages in the *Vāyupurāṇa* which give views regarding the origin of the Vedas and the Saṁhitās.[288] He has also referred to the *Gayāmāhātmya* in the *Vāyupurāṇa*.[289] Four extracts from the *Matsyapurāṇa* relating to war and peace have been given by the same scholar.[290] V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar concludes that the major portion of the present *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* existed from the commencement of the Christian era.[291] Gode puts the date of the *Kālikāpurāṇa* before 1000 A. D.[292] Raghavan states 700 A. D. as the earlier limit of the *Kālikāpurāṇa* and gives a summary of its contents[293]. R. C. Hazra distinguishes between the present and an earlier *Kālikāpurāṇa* and places the former between the 10th and the 11th century A. D.[294] In his article on the *Garuḍapurāṇa*[295], S. B. Chaudhury proves, contrary to H. P. Sastri's view, that the *Garuḍa* as it exists now, could not have received its final shape before 10th or 11th century A. D. "Polity in the Purāṇas" has been dealt with by Dikshitar [296], where references to the *Viṣṇu*, *Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Agni Purāṇas* have been given.

Walter Ruben appears to have made an exhaustive study of the Kṛṣṇa proble n from the texts of the different *Purāṇas*. In the

282. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 448-460.
283. *IHQ*, X, pp. 767-779.
284. *Festschrift Winternitiz*, pp. 56-65.
285. *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 537-549; also, *PO*, II, pp. 15-17.
286. *JBORS*, XV. pp. 183-194.
287. *JUB*, X, pp. 148-155.
288. *Ind. Hist. Congress*, Lahore, pp. 77-79.
289. *BRRI*, IX, pp. 65-67.
290. *Annals SVOI*, I, pp. 17-26.
291. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 370-371.
292. *JOR*, X, pp. 289-294.
293. *JOR*, XII, pp. 331-360.
294. *ABORI*, XXII, pp. 1-23.
295. *IHQ*, VI, pp. 553-560 (in collaboration with S. C. Banerji).
296. *Ind. Rev*, 1935, pp. 365-368.

original text of the Kṛṣṇa epic,[297] Ruben reconstructs the 'archetype' of Kṛṣṇa's Kāliya adventure which contains only 33 stanzas as against the *Brahma* (56), *Viṣṇu* (80), *Harivaṁśa* (109), *Bhāgavata* (68), *Brahmavaivarta* (108), *Padma* (6), and *Agni* (1). Another article by Ruben aims at showing that the original supplement (*Khila*) to the *Mbh* was much shorter than the *Khila Harivaṁśa* now current.[298] In the "Puranic line of heroes"[299] Ruben seeks to prove that the *Harivaṁśa* is a genuine supplement of the *Mahābhārata* ; therefore the *Harivaṁśa* is the oldest *Purāṇa*; and many *Purāṇas* have borrowed from the *Harivaṁśa.* Kirfel[300] compares the different stories of the childhood of Kṛṣṇa from the *Bhāgavata, Brahma, Brahmavaivarta, Harivaṁśa, Padma* and *Viṣṇu Purāṇas* and gives a comparative text. Dikshitar[301] shows that Kṛṣṇa (along with Rādhā) had already attained popularity in the Tamil country in the early centuries of the Christian era and was worshipped as a very ancient god.

S. K. De has contributed a number of valuable articles on Bengal Vaiṣṇavism and his forthcoming book on the subject is eagerly awaited. In "Bhāgavatism and Sun-worship ",[302] De opposes Grierson's arguments in support of his theory that the monotheistic Bhakti doctrine of the Bhāgavata religion is a direct development of or was originally connected with Sun-worship. De's other articles refer to 'Bhakti-Rasa-Śāstra of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism',[303] 'Caitanya as an author',[304] 'Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's 'Caitanyacaritāmṛta'[305] and 'Avatāra in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism'.[306] Caitanya sect of Bengal is shown to have originated from the tradition of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and owed a great deal for its development to the mystic emotionalism interpreted and established by emotional Saṁnyāsins from the time of Srīdhara.[307] Another series of articles deals exhaustively with the 'Theology and Philosophy of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism '[308] in the light of various works

297. *Festschrift Thomas*, pp. 188-203.
298. *JAOS*, 61, pp. 115-127.
299. *JRAS*, 1941, pp, 247-256.
300. *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 298-316.
301. *IC*, IV, pp. 267-271.
302. *BSOS*, VI, iii.
303. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 643-688.
304. *IHQ*, X, pp. 301-320.
305. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 98-102.
306. *Kuppuswami Comm.* Vol., pp. 25-37.
307. *Festschrift Winternitz*. pp. 195-207.
308. *IC*, II, pp. 291-307 ; 447-464 ; 721-733 ; III, pp. 251-279 ; 633-651; IV, pp. 19-42.

such as as Sanātana's *Bṛhadbhāgavatāmṛta*, Rūpa's *Laghubhāgavatāmṛta*, Jīva's *Śrīkṛṣṇasaṁdarbha*, *Tattvasaṁdarbha*, etc. Bengal Vaiṣṇavism attaches highest importance to the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* as it is believed to have been composed by Vyāsa after *Brahmasūtras* and other *Purāṇas*. *Śrīkṛṣṇasaṁdarbha* is more theological than philosophical, and *Bhaktisaṁdarbha* gives the general characteristics of the devotional attitude of Bhakti. In another article, De writes about "some Bengal Vaiṣṇava Mss in Sanskrit" from the Dacca University Mss. Library.[309] Mrinal Das Gupta deals in detail with "early Viṣṇuism and Nārāyaṇīya worship.[310] Kamala Ray has written about ten incarnations of Viṣṇu in Bengal.[311] B. N. Krishnamurty Sarma[312] shows that Baladeva Vidyabhushana, a leading exponent of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, taught that the Caitanya school was really an offshoot of the Dvaita philosophy of Madhva.

Das Gupta in the third volume of his *Indian Philosophy*, devotes a chapter to the 'Philosophical Speculations of some of the selected Purāṇas',[313] where he considers the theories of the *Viṣṇu*, *Vāyu*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Nāradīya*, and *Kūrma Purāṇas* about Brahman, Kāla, Ahaṁkāra, Yoga, Bhakti. etc. Jos. Abs draws attention to the heterodox systems of philosophy propounded by different *Puraṇas*, where side by side with Brahmanic systems, Vedānta, glorification of sacrifices, etc., we find some doctrines of Buddhism, and the inclusion of Buddha among the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu.[314] The present writer has contributed an article on "Purāṇic Cosmogony", where cosmogonic ideas of the Hindus have been examined from the Vedic times down to the time of the *Purāṇas*.[315]

S. L. Katre in his well-documented paper on "Avātaras of God" deals in detail with 33 incarnations of god on the basis of Purāṇic sources, giving a useful survey of the material on Avatāras scattered in different *Purāṇas*.[316]

R. S. Satyasrayi gives an account of the ancient Ṛṣi Aṅgiras and his familly from the Vedas and *Purāṇas* and also of their propagation of the Vedic culture.[317] Ancient Bhṛgus have similarly

309. *IC*, I, pp. 21-29.
310. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 93-116; 343-358; 735-759; VIII, pp. 64-84.
311. *IHQ*, XVII, pp. 370-385.
312. *IC*, IV, pp. 429-434.
313. Cambridge, 1940. Chap. XIII; pp. 496-511.
314. *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 386-396.
315. *Bhāratīya, Vidyā*, II, pp. 177-191.
316 *Allahabad Univ. Studies*, X, pp. 37-130.
317. *JBORS*, XXVI, ii.

been dealt with by A. Padmanabhayya from Vedic, *Purāṇic* and epic literature.[318]

M. N. Ray writes about some *vidyās* in the *Purāṇas*, where he differentiates between *parā* and *aparā vidyā*, and between *Vidyā* and *Kalā* : 64 *vidyās* mentioned in the *Purāṇas* have been enumerated.[319] Ghose deals with the antiquity of Gayā.[320]

K. S. Ramaswami Sastri[321] tries to show how the *Purāṇas* explain the Vedas and how they have built up the national culture, and inspired the national literature. He also deals with the contents of the *Purāṇas*, their geographical and historical aspects, etc., and gives a brief summary of some *Purāṇas*.

POSTSCRIPT : Winternitz refers to the ascetic poetry in the *Mbh* in "*Some Problems of Indian Literature*".[1] The ascetic poetry is found in the didactic sections of the *Mbh*, and reference has been made to the Vidūrahitavākya, Dharmavyādhakathā, Mokṣadharma, Anugītā, etc., which have their seeds not in the Vedic or Brahmaṇical literature, but in non-Vedic popular literature. In "Ancient Indian Ballad Poetry",[2] the same scholar shows that out of a cycle of ballads on the great war between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, some great poet shaped the great epic, *Mahābhārata*, which was originally only a heroic poem ; similarly, the *Rāmāyaṇa* grew out of the ancient ballad of Rāma and Rāvaṇa. The *Bhagavadgītā*, Nalopākhyāna, Sāvitryupākhyāna, etc., from the *Mbh* have been stated to have become part of the world literature[3]. The *Mahābhārata*[4] by Winternitz takes a general survey of the epic, wherein the author refers to the old and later portions of the *Mbh* and stresses the need of a critical edition of the *Mbh* as the basis for higher criticism. G. Czerny deals with the interpretation and development of metempsychosis in the Ādiparvan of the *Mbh*[5] ;

318. *JOR*, V, pp. 55-67 ; 80-100.
319. *Krishnaswami Aiyangar Comm. Vol.* pp. 308-316.
320. *JBORS*, Sept. 1938.
321. *Cult, Her.*, I, pp. 169-182.

1. Calcutta, 1925, pp. 21-40, ' Ascetic Literature in Ancient India"
2. *op. cit.*, pp. 41-58.
3. "Indian Literature and World Literature", *op. cit.*, pp. 59-81.
4. *Viśva-Bhāratī Qutly*, Jan. 1924, pp. 343-359.
5. *Die Seelenwanderung im Mahabhārata*, Tübingen, 1927.

Ṛta, kāla, etc., have been treated. R. N. Dandekar is serially bringing out the critical edition of *Jñānadīpikā*, Mahābhārata-tātparyaṭīkā, by Devabodha, the oldest commentator on the *Mbh*[6].

In his "*Bhagavadgītā-A Fresh Study*"[7], D. D. Vadekar makes a plea for the historical study and interpretation of the *Gītā*. He criticises both Śaṁkara and Tilak. According to the author, the *Gītā* is a synthesis of Rāmānuja's Qualified Monism and Tilak's Activism. In continuation of his particular theories about Vedic gods, etc., V. G. Rele[8] expounds the *Gītā* on the basis of psycho-philosophy and psycho-analysis. Aurobindo Ghose's "*Essays on the Gītā*"[9] present a new approach to the *Gītā*; the *Gītā* is interpreted not as a philosophical doctrine but as a practical guide to life, to the highest spiritual life-which is not a turning away from the world and its actualities, nor a pursuit of mere ethical or mentally motivated activities-which is rather a life here below of Actionless Action, of action held in God-consciousness. The distinguished author approaches the *Gītā* for help and light, and his aim is to distinguish its essential and living message which humanity requires for its perfect and spiritual welfare. The book will be of practical help in the spiritual path. "*Śrīmad-Bhagavad-gītā*"[10] by Anil Baran Roy (in Bengali) is based on Aurobindo's philosophy and faithfully follows Aurobindo's thought. The introduction deals with the interpretation of classical commentators like Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja, and thinkers like Rāmakṛṣṇa and Tilak, and tries to show that the new standpoint is the best as it avoids their demerits and preserves all that is best in them.

Among the translations of the *Bhagavadgītā*, may be included the metrical translation by A. W. Ryder,[11] "*Song of the Lord*" with introduction and notes by E. J. Thomas,[12] "*The Gospel of the Lord Śrīkṛṣṇa*"[13] by Purohit Swami, and "*The Message of the Gītā as interpreted by Śrī Aurobindo*"[14] by Anil Baran Roy, which besides the text and translation, gives copious notes, appendices, glossary and index.

---

6. *ABORI*, XXII, pp. 135-170; 307-354.
7. Poona, 1928.
8. *Bhagavad-gītā*, Bombay, 1930.
9. Calcutta, First Series, 2nd Ed, 1926; Second Series, 1928.
10. Calcutta, 1941.
11. Chicago, 1930.
12. London, 1931.
13. London, 1935.
14. Bombay, 1938.

In his "*Sādhanā of the Bhagavadgītā*",[15] S. K. Maitra gives a compendious analysis of the *Bhg* viewed as a practical scripture illuminating the paths of spiritual realization. Matilal Das deals with the psychological and ethical teachings of the *Gītā*.[16]

The Bengal recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with Lokanātha's ṭīkā and Bengali translation is being published in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series.[17] The text has been issued in parts. The earlier parts were edited by Amaresvara Thakur and Narendra Chandra Vedāntatīrtha, and Hemanta Kumar Kāvya-Vyākaraṇa-Tarka-Tīrtha is the present editor. G. A. Grierson has collected and edited the fragments of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Kashmiri by Divākaraprakāśabhaṭṭa, he had been able to procure. His "*Kashmiri Rāmāyaṇa*"[18] comprises Srīrāmāvatāracarita and Lavakuśayuddhacarita. The story presents many variations from Vālmīki's version, Sītā being described as the daughter of Rāvaṇa. Mention may also be made of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which the Svadhyaya Mandala of Aundh is bringing out, edited by S. D. Satavlekar, especially on account of the exhaustive and detailed introduction dealing with various important and interesting problems connected with the epic. A. Zieseniss[19] has considered the origin and development of Javanese Rāma legends. M. N. Ray has written about the food and drink in the Rāmāyaṇic age,[20] and about the civilization of the Vānaras as depicted in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[21]. He has also prepared an index to the proper names occurring in the *Rāmāyaṇa* based on Bombay and Calcutta editions.[22]

Following Kirfel's method, J. D. L. de Vries has considered comparative texts for the Śrāddhakalpa in the *Harivaṁśa* and five other *Purāṇas* to arrive at the original.[23] The author finds two groups: (A) *Harivaṁśa*, *Brahmāṇḍa*-P., *Śiva*-P., and *Vāyu*-P., and (B) *Matsya*-P. and *Padma*-P. E. Abegg gives a detailed

15. *Vedānta Kesarī*, XXVII, pp. 164-172, 220-229.
16. *Cal. Rev.*, 82, pp. 246 ff.
17. Calcutta, 1933 onwards.
18. Calcutta, 1930; Bibliotheca Indica, No. 253.
19. *Die Rāma-Sage bei den Malaien.* Hamburg, 1928.
20. *Sarasvati Bh. Studies*, IV, pp. 109-123.
21. *op. cit.* V, pp. 19-73.
22. *op. cit.*, Vols V onwards.
23. *Der Śrāddhakalpa im Harivaṁśa und in fünf anderen Purāṇen*, Bonn, 1928.

analysis of the contents of the Pretakalpa of the *Garuḍa*-P.,[24] which treats of death, the dead and the beyond. The Indian flood-legends and the *Matsya*-P. have been studied by A. Hohenberger[25] where he deals with the worship of Viṣṇu.

J. D. L. de Vries in his "Purāṇa-Studies"[26] gives comparative texts of a portion of the two groups of the *Purāṇas* about Śrāddha ritual already dealt with in his earlier work. D. R. Patil has appended tables comparing the Purāṇic traditions with the Gupta inscriptions covering about 300 points[27].

Abbreviations

ABORI	—Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
Acta Or	—Acta Orientalia.
Annals SVOI	—Annals of Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.
BISMQtly	—Bharata Itihasa Samsodhaka Mandala Quartarly, Poona.
BORI	—Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
BRRI	—Bulletin of the Ramavarma Research Institute, Trichur.
BSOS	—Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London.
Bull. DCRI	—Bulletin of the Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, Poona.
Cal. Rev.	—Calcutta Review, Calcutta.
Cult. Her.	—Cultural Heritage of India, Vols. I-III, Calcutta.
IA	—Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
IC	—Indian Culture, Calcutta.
IHQ	—Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
Indol. Prag.	—Indologica Pragensia.
Ind. Rev.	—Indian Review, Madras.
JAHRS	—Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry.

24. *Der Pretakalpa des Garuḍa Purāṇa*, Leipzig, 1921.
25. *Die indische Flutsage und das Matsyapurāṇa*, Leipzig, 1930.
26. *Festschrift Pavry*, pp. 482-487.
27. *Bull. DCRI*, II, also App.

JAOS	—Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JASB	—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JAssamRS	—Journal of the Assam Research Society.
JBBRAS	—Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.
JBHU	—Journal of the Benares Hindu University, Benares.
JBORS	—Journal of the Behar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.
JDL	—Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta.
JGIS	—Journal of the Greater India Society, Calcutta.
JGRS	—Journal of the Gujarat Research Society, Bombay.
JIH	—Journal of Indian History, Madras.
JISOA	—Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, Calcutta.
JOR	—Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
Journ. Ind. Sch. Ved. Res.	—Journal of the Indian School of Vedic Research.
JRAS	—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
JRASB	—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JUB	—Journal of the University of Bombay, Bombay.
JUPHS	—Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society.
NIA	—New Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
NPP	—Nagari Pracarini Parisad Patrika, Benares.
OLD	—Oriental Literary Digest, Poona.
OLZ	—Oriental Literatur Zeitung.
PO	—Poona Orientalist, Poona.
Proc. Or. Conf.	—Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference.
QJMS	—Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.
ZII	—Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF PRĀKRIT STUDIES

A. M. GHATAGE

The early stages of Prākrit studies were marked by the important fact that they were mostly carried by a small group of Sanskrit scholars, who were led to them by some indirect way. They formed some kind of by-product as it were of Sanskrit philology and naturally remained in the background for a long time, without assuming the necessary proportions to constitute a subject by themselves. In the field of Sanskrit studies, the drama attracted the attention of scholars very early and naturally the study of Prākrit at this stage was chiefly confined to the study of the dramatic dialects. The Prākrit passages form a considerable part of Sanskrit dramas and show a number of dialects which were named by the rhetoricians and described by the Prākrit grammarians. It was mainly the work of Pischel which first brought to light the importance of properly understanding the Prākrits in the Sanskrit dramas. In connection with the problem of deciding the original recension of *Śākuntala* (Kiel, 1877) Pischel published the Bengali recension of that drama with particular care bestowed on the Prākrit passages and his hope that 'this edition will contribute to a better knowledge of scenic Prākrits' was fully realised. It is generally admitted that this recension preserves the Prākrit passages in a far better condition than the Devanāgarī recension which Weber favoured. In this connection it is to be noted that Pischel thought it advisible to follow the principle of correcting the Mss. with the help of the statements of the Prākrit grammarians, particularly Vararuci, known to him at that time. He also accepted the formula of the rhetoricians that the prose of the drama should be in Śaurasenī and the verses in Māhārāṣṭrī. In his edition of 1877, Pischel allows the intervocalic *-d-* in the verses of *Śākuntala*, which Vararuci allowed in Māhārāṣṭrī, at least in a number of words.

Pischel was followed by a number of scholars who edited Sanskrit dramas, but few appear to have devoted so much care on the Prākrits as he did. There are good editions of the other two dramas of Kālidāsa by S. P. Pandit (*Mālavikāgnimitra*, BSS, 2nd Ed, 1889 ; *Vikramorvaśīya*, BSS, 2nd Ed, 1889) who presented the Prākrit passages with care and paid particular attention to the Apabhraṁśa verses in the 4th act of *Vikramorvaśīya*, though he regarded them as spurious. Except for the orthographical peculiarity of doubling the

aspirates, the Prākrit passages are fairly correct, though the editor has not followed the Prākrit grammarians in presenting the dialectal features. Fairly good from the Prākrit point of view is the edition of *Mṛcchakaṭika* by Godbole (BSS, 1896) though a more critical edition of this all important drama for Prākrits is urgently needed. Useful to students of Prākrit are further the editions of *Mālatīmādhava* by Bhandarkar (2nd Ed, 1905), of *Mudrārākṣasa* by Telang (3rd Ed, 1900), of *Ratnāvalī* by Cappeller in the 2nd edition of Böhtlingk's Chrestomathie (1877) where the usual chāyā is replaced by a Prākrit-Sanskrit index. But the most important edition after Pischel's *Śākuntala* was, no doubt, the admirable edition of *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara by S. Konow (HOS, 1901). This is a Saṭṭaka wholly written in Prākrit. Konow, a student of Pischel, took great pains in collecting a large number of Mss. and constituting a critical text of the drama on an uniform plan. The edition supplies a very full critical apparatus. Konow follows a rigorous method in making the verses of the drama pure Māhārāṣṭrī and the prose Śaurasenī by an eclectic procedure. By applying the improved standard of dialectal differences between the two languages as supplied by Pischel's Grammar, he came to the conclusion that Rājaśekhara did not make a fine distinction between the two. Naturally his text gives a different appearance than that of *Śākuntala* by Pischel.

In spite of the great number of editions of Sanskrit dramas issued in India, very few show any merit in presenting the Prākrit passages in a critical form. In 1911 Hillebrandt published an edition of *Mudrārākṣasa* (Breslau, 1911) based on a number of old Mss. and on the authority of his Ms. material he came to the conclusion that the verses in that play were either in Śaurasenī or Māgadhī but not in Māhārāṣṭrī, which view came in conflict with the usual supposition upto that time. At this time a number of plays were discovered in South India and published by T. Gaṇapatiśāstrī from Trivandrum (1910-1915), who ascribed them to the famous poet Bhāsa. In the long-drawn controversy that followed, the Prākrits of these plays played an important rôle and a detailed analysis of these was given by Printz (*Bhāsa's Prākrit*, Frankfurt a. M., 1921). He pointed out a number of peculiarities which may safely be assumed as marking an earlier stage in the growth of these languages. The orthography of the South Indian Mss. must also have played a rôle in giving these Prākrits their present appearance. More important for the history of the Prākrits was the

publication of the fragments of the dramas of Aśvaghoṣa by Lüders (Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, Berlin, 1911). The editor pointed out that these fragments contain dialects which may be called old forms of Māgadhī, Ardha-Māgadhī and Śaurasenī. The absence of Māhārāṣṭrī is important and we are now in a position to know what form these Prākrit dialects had before the time of the Prākrit grammarians. The careful tabulation of all the forms of these fragments by the editor is of extreme use in judging the relative antiquity of a Prākrit form in later works as in case of Bhāsa.

In 1922 the HOS published a second edition of Pischel's *Śākuntala*, worked out by Cappeller. The edition was based on the changes made by Pischel himself in his inter-leaved copy of the first edition and most of these changes were due to grammatical considerations dealt with fully in his *Grammatik*. Thus intervocalic *-d-* was eliminated from the verses, forms in *-ijja* were replaced by those in *-ia* in prose and so on. No new Ms. material of note was used.

Of other editions of classical dramas worthy of note for the critical presentation of the Prākrits, mention may be made of the *Mahāvīracarita* by Todar Mall (Oxford, 1928) as an illustration of giving the Prākrit passages in a form purely based on the Ms. material and in no way tampering it with grammatical considerations. This has, however, led the editor to call in question the ability of Bhavabhūti to use Śaurasenī in a pure form which may in reality be due to the defect of our Ms. material itself. The relegation of the chāyā to notes and the index of important Prākrit words are features certainly conducive to a better study of the Prākrit original. The editions of *Ratnāvalī* by Profs. C. R. Devadhar and N. G. Suru and of *Priyadarśikā* by Prof. Suru (Poona, 1928) also give the Pākrit passages in a correct form but it is not clear whether they are based on Ms. authority. The edition of *Moharājaparājaya* by Muni Chaturavijaya and Dalal (Baroda, 1918) and of *Nalavilāsa* by L. B. Gandhi (Baroda, 1926) are of interest as the authors have written the Prākrits after the rules of Hemacandra's grammar.

Again it is the drama *Karpūramañjarī* which is responsible in giving a new orientation to the study of dramatic Prākrits. A new edition by M. M. Ghosh (Calcutta, 1939) is important in making use of a method of text-constitution faithful to the Mss. instead of following the standard of the grammarians and choosing the read-

ing best suited to it. In his elaborate introduction the editor has discussed the textual problem thoroughly and has come to the conclusion that it is all written in one dialect called Śaurasenī. This has led the editor to the other extreme of calling even the *Setubandha* a work not in Māhārāṣṭrī but in Śaurasenī and he naturally rejects the so-called Śaurasenī features like intervocalic *-d-*, Locative singular in *-e* as being accurate.

The problem of the Prākrit dialects occupying such an important place in the Sanskrit dramas and the probable origin of this usage were dealt with by S. Lévi in his famous work *Le Theatre Indien* (Paris, 1890) and the more recent work of Keith *Sanskrit Drama* (Oxford, 1924) is equally valuable as giving brief resumés of the Prākrit peculiarities of the important dramas of the classical period. The Prākrit of a later drama called *Kundamālā* is studied systematically by P. V. Rāmānujasvāmi in his article *The Prākrit in Kundamālā* and he comes to the conclusion that 'it presents the normal Prākrit of the later dramas' and its peculiarities are those of the South Indian orthography.

As compared to the vast number of editions of Sanskrit dramas there are very few good ones for the Prākrit passages, even for the best known plays. It is to be hoped that future editors would give greater attention to this aspect of their work and make up for the deficiency which is so keenly felt.

It was again the work of Weber which first brought into prominence the Prākrit literature in Māhārāṣṭrī. The famous anthology of 700 verses of mostly erotic contents called *Sattasaī* was first edited by him in 1870 (Leipzig) but it contained only 370 gāthās in that edition. He made some additions in ZDMG (1872 and 1874) and finally a complete edition of the work was given out (Leipzig, 1881). The preface deals with literary and historical questions like the different recensions of the work which number as many as six, the authorship of Hāla and his probable date and the date of the anthology which Weber is inclined to put in the 3rd century A. D. The edition gives a German translation of many of the verses and exhaustive notes on all and a complete word-index at the end. In an appendix are found collected verses cited in the Alaṁkāra works. In the new edition, however, the grammatical sketch contained in the first was dropped. Later on Weber dealt with the commentary of Bhuvanapāla which gives the names of the poets of the anthology (*Indische Studien*, XVI).

The equally famous Prākrit epic, the *Setubandha* of Pravarasena, also received an excellent editor in Siegfried Goldschmidt. Originally the first two chapters of the work were edited by Paul Goldschmidt but the complete edition of the whole work was published by both, Siegfried being responsible for the editing of the text and the German translation and for working up the word-index left behind by Paul (Strassburg, 1880–1883). The editor has discussed in his preface the two recensions of the work, one of Rāmadāsa and the other of Kṛṣṇa while he gives the third Āśvāsaka of a free Sanskrit rendering of the work by Śivanārāyaṇadāsa. In spite of the fact that Hemacandra used this work for his Prākrit grammar and is considerably older than the extant Mss. of the work, the editor feels himself justified in not correcting the evidence of the Mss. with the help of the rules of the grammarians, particularly when it is not the question of specific teaching but only of implication. Thus forms with-*d*- are retained, though Hemacandra rejects them in Māhārāṣṭrī. The few rhymes of the work are found to be of no great use in deciding the linguistic nature of the Prākrit.

In 1887 S. P. Pandit published in BSS his edition of *Gaüḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja, a historical epic, from a number of good MSS. to which his attention was drawn by Bühler. The work, though of high poetic value, is of little historical worth. Pandit edited it with great care and following the practice of the majority of his Mss. he preserved -y-śruti throughout the book, which Pischel thought it necessary to remove in his *Grammatik*. The edition also contains a brief commentary of Haripāla, a Jain writer, and a complete word-index. The text was constituted on an ecletic method and the Mss. showed a considerable divergence in the arrangement of the Gāthās. Pandit's text differs often from that of the commentator Haripāla. But the real contribution of the editor is to be found in his elaborate introduction which gives a summary of the work, deals with the date of the author and puts forth a vigorous plea for the Prākrit studies. The second edition of the work was issued by Utgikar (Poona, 1927) with four additional notes to the introduction, dealing with the literary form of the poem about which different views were expressed by scholars like Bühler and Jacobi, about the other work of the author *Mahumahaviaa* and some remarks about his date.

With the publication of these works, it appeared for a long time that purely Māhārāṣṭrī works were nearly exhausted and no new works of this type were to be found. The descriptive catalogue of

Mss. in the Jain Bhandaras at Jesalmere by Dalal (GOS, Baroda, 1923), however, described a work called *Līlāvatī* by a non-Jain writer, who called himself Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭatanaya. The story deals with the marriage of the Sinhala princess Līlāvatī with the Āndhra king Śātavāhana and it is written as a continuous narration without the usual divisions. The style and the method of narration make it a different type of work from the artificial epics and though the initial poetic excellence is not kept to the end the work deserves to be published. It was only in South India that the study of the Prākrit grammar, particularly that of Vararuci, was continued upto recent times and the South Indian Pandits composed Prākrit epics to show their skill in Prākrit grammar as well. Dr. A. N. Upādhye's edition of *Kaṁsavadha* of Rāmapāṇivāda (Bombay, 1940) brought to light one such late product of Prākrit poetry. This small epic dealing with the life of Kṛṣṇa and the killing of Kaṁsa, in four cantos and showing a variety of metres, was edited with a masterly introduction dealing with all the literary and historical problems connected with the work, a translation, a Sanskrit chāyā probably by the author himself and notes. A second epic by the same writer *Uṣāniruddha* is also published by him in the Journal of the Bombay University (Bombay, 1941) with a brief introduction and a select glossary. The same scholar has also drawn attention of the Prākrit students to other works like the *Śauricarita* of Śrīkaṇṭha, while the first canto of the *Śrīcinhakāvya* of the famous saint Bilva-maṅgala alias Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka is published by him in the Bhāratīya Vidyā (Bombay, 1941) as a specimen of a work which attempts to illustrate the grammatical rules of Vararuci and thus supplies indirect help for the text of the grammar, a point dealt with in the introduction. It is to be hoped that many late works of this type may yet be found in the South Indian Mss. collections.

Most of the work of editing and publishing the Prākrit grammars was done long ago, partly because they were written in Sanskrit and easy to understand and partly on account of the fact that a thorough knowledge of the Indian system of Prākrit grammar must precede a proper understanding of the Prākrits themselves. It is quite natural that Prākrit scholars began with these grammatical works from the very start of the Prākrit studies. Cowell issued his admirable edition of Vararuci's *Prākṛta-Prakāśa* along with its oldest commentary the *Manoramā* of Bhāmaha (London, 2nd Issue, 1868) which, however, was not available for the last chapter of the Sūtras dealing with Śaurasenī. To make up for this deficiency Cowell added in an appendix the corresponding Sūtras of Hema-

candra. The edition of the text with all the variants, English translation, and a complete index and in addition the excellent printing make the book admirable in every respect. This was followed by the edition of the Prākrit grammar forming the 8th chapter of Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana* called *Siddhahemacandra* in two parts (Halle, 1877, 1880) by R. Pischel, undoubtedly the best edition of a Prākrit grammar even to the present day. Hemacandra is the most exhaustive grammarian of the Prākrit languages who has dealt with them with astonishing thoroughness, utilising all the sources available to him. In particular his contribution to Apabhraṁśa grammar remains unsurpassed by any other Prākrit grammarian. Moreover, his grammar is arranged on a very practical plan. But what renders the work still more useful is the excellent and painstaking work of Pischel who has given the text with an index verborum in the first part and a translation of the Sūtras with explanations and comparative notes of very wide range in the second. To exhibit clearly the interrelation of the older Sūtras of Vararuci and the later ones of Trivikrama, a close comparison of all of them is duly noted in the margin of the text. Hemacandra's grammar was again edited by Pandit as an appendix to his edition of the *Kumārapālacarita* (BSS, 1900), a second edition of which is recently issued by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, who had also edited it previously with notes (Poona, 1928).

The *Prākṛta-Lakṣaṇa* of Caṇḍa is much fragmentary and has come down to us in an imperfect condition. Hoernle edited it (Calcutta, 1880) with extreme care but with some amount of over-conservatism in accepting the extent of the text, in which he was probably influenced by his idea of evolving the grammar of Ardha-Māgadhī proper from Caṇḍa's rules by a process of interpretation which cannot be accepted as valid. Nevertheless the edition is useful because of the full presentation of the various readings and the index of words, though the grammatical discussion in the introduction must be used with caution.

In 1909 E. Hultzsch published in an excellent form the *Prākṛta-rūpāvatāra* of Siṁharāja (Royal Asiatic Society, London), a work nearly complete and a kind of epitome of the so-called Vālmīki-sūtras in whose existence the editor firmly believed. The value of the work is little but the editor's presentation makes the work attractive and the full comparison with the Sūtras of Hemacandra and the full tabulation of forms add some value to it. The same Sūtras form the basis of the *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* of Lakṣmīdhara

which is edited by K. P. Trivedi (BSS, 1916) with Indroduction in which the editor unsuccessfully tried to prove the existence of the work of Vālmīki, critical and explanatory notes and appendices of the Sūtras, paradigms etc. In reality the original Sūtras belong to Trivikrama whose *Prākṛta-vyākaraṇa* with his own *Vṛtti* was partly published at Vizagapatam (1895) and a complete edition of which is in progress (Benares) being prepared by Batuk Nath Sharma and Baldeva Upadhyaya; but from what has been published the latter appears to be a very uncritical and unsatisfactory attempt.

Of the works of the so-called Eastern School of Prākrit grammarians, the grammar of Kramadīśvara is not yet given out in a separate edition, though Rajendralal Mitra undertook the edition many decades ago. The best representative of this school, Mārkaṇḍeya, finds in S. P. V. Bhattanathaswami an excellent editor for his *Prākṛta-sarvasva* (Vizagapatam, 1927) whose citations the editor has carefully traced to their sources, and it is to be regretted that he was not able to publish the second part which was expected to include an introduction and indices so necessary for such a work. The *Prākṛta-kalpataru* of Rāmatarkavāgīśa was even less fortunate and it is available only in parts. Sir George Grierson published from time to time parts of it as *Paiśācī in the Prākṛta-kalpataru* (IA ,XLIX) *The Apabhraṁśa Stabakas of Rāmaśarman* (IA, LI) *The Śaurasenī and Māgadhī Stabakas of Rāmaśarman* (IA, LVI, LVII) while the whole of the first Śākhā dealing with the main Prākrit except the Dhātvādeśas is recently edited by Nitti-Dolci (Paris, 1939), along with a translation in French. Thus the major portion of the work is available in print and the absence of sufficient Mss. make it difficult to publish the work fully. An important addition to the list of the Prākrit grammarians is to be found in the publication by the same scholar of the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* of Puruṣottama who is the oldest representative of the eastern school. The only Ms. of this work was to be found in Nepal. The book lacks the first two chapters, as the Ms. is defective at the beginning. The edition is prepared with care and includes a good French translation and the author has succeeded in interpreting the work even in the absence of a commentary. She deals with the date and other grammatical works of Puruṣottama at great length in her introduction to the work. A late grammar, the *Prākṛta-cintāmaṇi* of Śubhacandra is given out in part by Dr. Upadhye in his article dealing with *Śubhacandra and his Prākrit Grammar* (ABORI, XIII). The *Prākṛta-prakāśa* is re-edited with the important addi-

tions of the two commentaries, the *Saṁjīvinī* of Vasantarāja and the *Subodhinī* of Sadānanda, at Benares (1927) while a commentary in verse attributed to Kātyāyana was already published in Bombay (1913). All these commentaries only take note of the first eight chapters of Vararuci, which correspond with the first nine in Cowell's edition and thus represent Vararuci's text as current in South India. The few verses and scanty prose in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata has been edited and translated by M. M. Ghosh in his article *The date of the Bhāratīyanāṭyaśāstra* (J. Dept. of Lett., Calcutta, 1934).

A number of questions connected with the Prākrit grammarians are dealt with in individual articles from time to time. Pischel collected the Deśī words in the grammar of Trivikrama from 1879 to 1888, while Th. Bloch in his thesis *Vararuci und Hemacandra* (Gutersloh, 1893) treated of the inter-relation of the two works and found the Prākrit grammars of small value. Dr. T. K. Laddu gave an analysis of the grammar of Trivikrama and proved his authorship for the Sūtras and the Vṛtti in his Inaugural Dissertation *Prologomena zu Trivikramas Prākrit Grammatik* (Halle, 1912 ; Eng. Tr., ABORI, 1929) while the same grammar formed the topic of Bhattanathaswami's article *Trivikrama and his followers* (IA, 1911) and Dr. A. N. Upadhye's article *Vālmīki-Sūtra a Myth* (Bhāratīya Vidyā, 1941). The Śaurasenī section of Mārkaṇḍeya was translated by Hultzsch in ZDMG, 66, while Grierson contributed the articles: *The Bṛhatkathā in Mārkaṇḍeya* (JRAS, 1913), *Apabhraṁśa according to Mārkaṇḍeya and Ḍhakkī Prākrit* (JRAS, 1913), *the Prākrit Dhātvādeśas according to the Western and the Eastern Schools of Prākrit Grammarians* (Calcutta, 1924), *The Eastern School of Prākrit Grammarians* (Calcutta, 1925).

A comprehensive but necessarily brief review of the Prākrit grammars is to be found in Winternitz' *Geschichte der indischen Literatur* (Vol. III) and Keith's *History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford, 1928). But the first attempt at a real history of Prākrit grammars is to be found in *Les Grammariens Prākrits* of Nitti-Dolci (Paris, 1938) which surveys in a detailed manner the principal Prākrit grammars and treats them in a scholarly manner even entering into minute details. After a brief introduction the *Prākṛta-Prakāśa* of Vararuci is subjected to a close analysis in order to ascertain its precise relation to the *Sattasaī* of Hāla and the principal variants of his Sūtras are given according to his commentators, Bharata's XVII chapter dealing with Prākrit is edited anew with

the additional help of a Nepalese Ms. and translated. The question of the dhruvas which first attracted the attention of Jacobi (*Exkurs über die jüngeren literarischen Prākritsprachen* in the edition of *Bhavisattakaha*, 1918) and which were re-edited by M. M. Ghosh as *Prākrit verses in Nāṭyaśāstra* (IHQ, 1932) is dealt with and the author comes to the conclusion that they are in Śaurasenī and that according to Bharata the verses in the dramas should be in this language while the prose is in a Prākrit which is nearer the later Māhārāṣṭrī. The eastern school of the Prākrit grammarians then receives a detailed treatment and their essential agreement is pointed out. The author is convinced that though represented by late works, it preserves an old tradition of value. The remaining grammarians are then taken separately. Hemacandra's indebtedness to earlier writers like Namisādhu is fully pointed out and the shortcomings of the work are noted. The author tries to find textual support for the existence of the Sūtras of Vālmīki in the works of Hemacandra and Trivikrama and finally the works of Kramadīśvara and Caṇḍa are evaluated. Thus the work covers the entire field of Prākrit grammar and does justice to the subject to a considerable extent.

In the field of Prākrit grammar by modern scholars a good beginning was made by the grammatical introduction of Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī* (Leipzig, 1886) which gave a concise but clear analysis of Jain Māhārāṣṭrī in all its aspects and the treatment of Prākrit syntax therein remains the only study of this aspect of the subject even to-day. All further work, mostly in the form of separate articles, was included and superseded by the monumental work of Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen* (Strassburg, 1900), which laid down the firm foundation of Prākrit philology in general and Prākrit grammar in particular. Giving in the introduction a sketch of the various Prākrit languages and their literature and a brief statement about the Prākrit grammars, the main work deals with the phonology and the forms of all the Prākrits with such a thoroughness that, even after the lapse of forty-years, it remains unsurpassed as an indispensable book of reference in the field. It embodies in a systematic form the views of the grammarians and analyses the available literature with astonishing minuteness and stands as a permanent monument of the author's labours spread over a number of years. The only deficiency of the work is also made good by the full word-index prepared by Vikramasinghe and published in the IA.

This exhaustive nature of the work has necessarily reduced further studies in the field to the nature of separate studies of individual points of Prākrit grammar or short summaries of the work itself. Thus R. Schmidt has summarised in his *Elementarbuch der Śauraseni* (Hannover, 1924) his rules on this particular dialect, while A. C. Woolner bases his *Introduction to Prākrit* (Calcutta, 2nd Ed, 1928) entirely on Pischel and deals with all the dialects. He, however, adds a new part, giving a good reader for the beginner. Equally important is the short grammatical introduction of B. D. Jain to his *Ardha-Māgadhī Reader* (Lahore, 1923) while a brief resumé of the grammar of Ardha-Māgadhī proper may be found in Dr. Vaidya's *Manual of Ardha-Māgadhī Grammar* (Poona, 1934) and A. M. Ghatage's *Introduction to Ardha-Māgadhī* (Kolhapur, 1941).

In the field of lexicography we have the edition of the *Pāialacchīnāmamālā* of Dhanapāla by Bühler (Bonn, 1879) which is a small tract in verses intended for the use of Prākrit poets. To the text is added a full glossary of Prākrit words with Sanskrit and German meanings. This was followed by the edition of Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* (the author gave it the name *Rayaṇāvalī*) by Pischel (Bombay, 1880) based on the collection of a number of Mss. and including the comment of the author himself with illustrative verses which Pischel thought to be devoid of meaning and as such coming from his pupil. The second part was to be worked by Bühler and was to include notes and index but it was never completed. Many years after, the work was edited with an index and an introduction putting forth a plea for the proper understanding of the illustrative verses by Banerjee at Calcutta (1931) and a second edition of the BSS edition was prepared by Ramanujasvami with the addition of the necessary index (Poona, 1938).

In the course of the years 1913–1925 was published at Ratlam a big encyclopædia of Jainism in Prākrit and Sanskrit in seven volumes called *Abhidhānarājendra*, a work of the Śvetāmbara monk Vijayarājendrasūri, which is mainly useful for the information culled from a vast commentorial literature, much of which is unpublished. But the real dictionary of the Prākrit languages is the comprehensive work of Pt. Haragovinda Seth called *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo* (Calcutta, 1923-1928) in four parts, a work of high merit, which gives Sanskrit equivalents and meanings in Hindī along with references to literature which are bound to be limited in scope in such a first attempt. The views expressed by the writer in the introdu-

ction on various Prākrit dialects are, however, not wholly acceptable and appear to stick to traditional facts even at the cost of accuracy. More elaborate is the *Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary* in five volumes by Śri Ratnachandra (Bombay, 1923-1932) which confines itself to the canon but gives the meanings in Sanskrit, Gujarātī, Hindī and English and supplies a good deal of information on the technical terms of Jainism some of which are also illustrated. But an exhaustive dictionary of the Prākrit languages on the model of Pāli or Sanskrit ones, yet remains a pressing need of Prākrit studies. Quite recently Prof. H. R. Kapadia has published a small volume giving the Ardha-Māgadhī equivalents of English words (Surat, 1941) which, though leaving much to be desired, is the only book of its kind.

A number of articles by different scholars are devoted to the linguistic nature of the Prākrit dialects and a variety of problems connected with them. Thus Māhārāṣṭrī receives a comprehensive review in *Māhārāṣṭrī language and Literature* (JUB, 1936) and its relation with *Śaurasenī* is dealt with by M. Ghosh in *Māhārāṣṭrī a later phase of Śaurasenī* (J. Dep. of Lett., Calcutta, 1933). The *Śaurasenī Prākrit* (JUB, 135) by A. M. Ghatage deals with the linguistic peculiarities of this dialect and how far they can be ascertained from available material. W. E. Clark has dealt thoroughly with the Māgadhī Prākrit in his article '*Māgadhī and Ardha-Māgadhī*' (JAOS, 44) and puts a vigorous plea for accepting the Ms. authority in case of both the languages in place of the rules of the grammarians. M. Shahidullah has pointed out that Bengali cannot be derived from the Māgadhī as known to us (*Māgadhī Prākrit and Bengāli*, IHQ, 1925), while J. Bloch points out its relation to the inscriptions of Aśoka (*Aśoka et la māgadhi*, BSOS, VI. 2). A detailed discussion about this Prākrit is to be found in *The Evolution of Māgadhī* by A. Banerji-Śāstrī (Oxford, 1922), which, however, remains incomplete. About Paiśācī we may note Grierson's *Rājaśekhara on the home of Paiśācī* (JRAS, 1921), *Paiśācī and Cūlikā-Paiśācī* (IA, 1923), Konow's *Home of Paiśācī* (ZDMG, 1910) and the comprehensive review in Dr. Upadhye's *Paiśācī Language and Literature* (ABORI, 1940). The various Vibhāṣās are discussed in Grierson's *The Prākṛta Vibhāṣās* (JRAS, 1918) and one of them is studied anew by M. A. Mehendale in *Ṭākkī or Ḍhakkī* (BDCRI, 1940). More general questions of Prākrit grammar are to be found in *The Pronunciation of Prākrit Palatals* (JARS, 1913) of Grierson, *Some Problems of Indo-Aryan Philology* (BSOS, 1930) by Bloch,

Observations on Middle Indian Morphology (BSOS, 1936) by Gray, *the Vasudevahiṇḍī, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī* (BSOS, 1936) by Alsdorf and many articles dealing with the explanation of individual words. Prākrit Syntax has been partly studied by A. M. Ghatage in his articles *Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhī* (IHQ, 1937), *Repetition in Prākrit Syntax* (NIA, 1939) and *Concord in Prākrit Syntax* (ABORI, 1940). The different possibilities of Prākrit studies in the field of linguistics are well pointed out by Dr. S. M. Katre in a number of articles like *A new Approach to the Study of Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan* (Bhāratīya Vidyā, 1940), *New Lines of Investigation in Indian Linguistics* (ABORI, 1940) and in his Wilson Philological Lectures for 1941, a summary of which is published as *Some Problems of Historical Linguistics in Indo-Aryan* (Bh. Vi., 1941). Quite a new approach to problems of Prākrit phonology is suggested in *Orthographical explanation of Certain Prākrit forms* by Dr. Upadhye. By way of contributions to Prākrit lexicography may be noted *Observations on Hemacandra's Deśīnāmamālā* (ABORI, VIII) of Dr P. L. Vaidya, *Kanarese Words in Deśī lexicons* (ABORI, XII) and *Materials for a Dhātupāṭha of Indo-Aryan* (Ind. Cul., 1938, 1939) by Dr. S. M. Katre. A good deal of discussion about Prākrits proper may also be met with in books dealing with Modern Indian languages by scholars like Bloch, Turner, Chatterji, Katre, Dave, Saksena, Varma and others. A brief but comprehensive review of the whole field may be found in *L'Indo-Aryen* (Paris, 1934) of J. Bloch.

The whole of the Jain canon was repeatedly published in Bombay, Calcutta and Sikandarabad along with commentaries of individual books aud translation into Hindī. But a critical edition of the entire canon is yet to be issued. Good editions of a few oft-read books are available. It was a few western scholars who first prepared really critical editions of the important books of the Ardha-Māgadhī canon. The first to be published was a fragment of the Bhagavatī the fifth Aṅga which Weber edited in two parts in the Abhandlungen der ZDMG (1865, 1866). The first part deals with the language while the second gives the story of Skandaka with translation. This was followed by the edition of Bhadrabāhu's *Kalpasūtra* by Jacobi (Leipzig, 1879) to which he added an introduction which for the first time proved the independence of Jainism from Buddhism and attempted the exact date of Mahāvīra. He also added extracts from the commentary and a full glossary. The same scholar later published in PTS. the edition of the *Ācārāṅga*

based on two Mss. (1892) with a brief preface comparing the language with Pāli. A part of the *Jñātādharmakathā*, another Aṅga, was edited by Steinthal (1881) while Leumann gave out his beautiful edition of the *Aupapātikasūtra*, the first Aṅga (Leipzig, 1883) and the *Einleitung* contains a systematic analysis of the contents of the book. The work is noteworthy on account of the presence of nearly all the important Varṇakas which are often referred to in other parts of the canon. The glossary brings many new explanations of words in Ardha-Māgadhī. He also edited the *Dasaveyāliyasutta* along with *Nijjutti* in ZDMG (1892). The collection of the five small Upāṅgas under the title *Nirayāvaliyāo* was edited by Warren (Amsterdam, 1879). An excellent edition of the seventh Aṅga called the *Uvāsagadasāo* accompanied by the commentary of Abhayadeva, an English translation, complete word-index and an appendix giving the translation of Bhagavatī (15th Saya) dealing with the life and teaching of Gosāla was published by Hoernle (Calcutta, 1890) and evoked from Pischel the praise of being the only Jain work with commentary which was critically edited.

In 1910 the first Śrutaskandha of the *Ācārāṅga*, which embodies the oldest parts of the canon, received a very careful and scholarly editor in Dr. W. Schubring, who added to the text parallel passages at the bottom, an analysis of its contents according to the form of the work and a glossary. The analysis mainly deals with the text problem and the nature of this curious prose which appears to embody verses or lines of verses and the whole gives an appearance of a mosaic of old and new parts. Of the Chedasūtras of the canon an excellent edition of the small work, the *Kalpasūtra*, was again due to Schubring (Leipzig, 1905) which contains an introduction dealing with the extent of the commentarial literature on the work, the contents of the Chedasūtras in general and their importance in the history of church organisation, a complete translation and notes and an index, making the edition a model one in all respects. The same scholar has further edited two other works of the same group, the *Vavahāra* and *Nisītha*, (Leipzig, 1918) with a brief introduction in which the editor discusses the different strata of the Sūtras.

In 1922 J. Charpentier edited the third Mūlasūtra called the *Uttarādhyayana* (Upsala) with an elaborate introduction dealing with the date of the Jain Canon and the process of its formation, the different strata of the text, the meaning of the title, causes of

the loss of the Pūrva works, and commentarial literature on the text. The editor has also added a commentary giving explanatory notes, which is noteworthy on account of the number of parallels from Buddhist sources. Dr. Vaidya edited the 2nd Aṅga, the *Sūyagaḍa*, with its *Nijjutti* (Poona, 1928) but the second part, which was expected to contain the introduction and notes, was not published. The same scholar has also published an uniform edition of a number of popular books of the canon like the *Paesikahāṇaya*, a part of the second Uvaṅga, *Uvāsagadasāo*, *Nirayāvaliyāo*, *Antagaḍadasāo*, *Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo*, and *Vivāgasuya* (Poona, 1928 foll.) All these works contain a brief introduction, notes and glossaries useful for students. The *Dasaveyāliya* with the *Nijjutti* of Bhadrabāhu was again edited by Prof. K. V. Abhyankar (Ahmedabad, 1932) from a fairly large number of Mss. while recently Prof. N.V. Vaidya issued his edition of the *Nāyādhammakahāo* (Poona, 1940) but here again the promised introduction etc. are lacking. The astronomical work called the *Sūryaprajñapti* has been edited by J. F. Kohl (Stuttgart, 1937) with an informative introduction in which the relation of the work with *Jambudvīpaprajñapti* and *Candraprajñapti* are discussed. Finally it should be noted that the famous Āgamodayasamiti established in Mhesana (Gujarat) has issued editions of most of the canonical texts from 1915 onwards, many of which are accompanied by Sanskrit commentaries and the Sanskrit portion of these works is carefully edited. Unfortunately the Prākrit portion was not done with equal care and no indication of the Mss. used is given. Moreover the editions were printed in limited numbers and could not be easily had even soon after publication.

By way of intensive study of individual books we have in the beginning Weber's essay "*Über die Sūryaprajñapti* (1868) and Jacobi's translation of the *Ācārāṅga* and the *Kalpasūtra* (SBE, 1884) and of *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* and *Uttarādhyayana* (SBE, 1895) with masterly introductions dealing with the origin and antiquity of Jainism and preparing once for all the firm basis of Jain studies. Later on Barnett translated the two Aṅgas, *Antagaḍadasāo* and *Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo*, (London, 1907). In 1907 Hüttemann wrote his thesis on the *Jñāta-Erzählungen* in which he summarised the stories of that book and pointed out parallel stories in other literature and also gave the scheme of the Jñātas according to the *Dasaveyāliyanijjutti*. The *Mahānisīthasūtra* (Berlin, 1918) was analysed as regards its contents, authorship, language and dogmatic information by Dr W. Schubring, and Kampf similarly studied the old Prakīrṇas in

his thesis *Über die vom Sterbefasten handelnden älteren Painna des Jaina-Kanons* (Hamburg, 1929). Dr A. Sen collected in his article *Schools and Sects in Jain Literature* (Viśvabhārati Quart., Vol. VIII) information on these topics mainly from the second Aṅga, while his thesis *A Critical Introduction to the Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṁ* (Wurzburg, 1936) puts to a searching criticism the work both as regards its contents and metre, and points out a number of regular and imperfect Veḍhas with the help of which Schubring attempted a rough chronology of the canon. Prof. M. V. Patwardhan has made a detailed and comprehensive study of the *Dasaveyāliya* in his work *Dasaveyāliya: A Study* (Sangli, 1933) with a close analysis of the metres used and also dealing with many general questions about the canon.

A comprehensive view of the whole canon was taken by Weber in *Über die heiligen Schriften der Jain* (Ind. Stu., 1883, 1885) in which he described the contents and nature of the books from Mss. In 1920 Winternitz wrote the first history of Prākrit literature which formed the second part of his *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, Vol. II. Both canonical and post-canonical works of the Jains were described so far as they were easily available to the author. This material was considerably enlarged and supplemented in the revised English translation of the work (Calcutta, 1933). But the best description of the canon, particularly the manner of its growth and its metrical and literary aspects, was given by Dr W. Schubring in his excellent introduction to his selection of the canonical passages called *Worte Mahāvīras* (Göttingen, 1926). In his latest work *Die Lehre der Jainas* (Leipzig, 1935) the third part, *Der Kanon und seine Teile*, is devoted to an accurate but schematic contents of the whole canon to which are added notes giving all important editions and exegetical works on them. Quite recently Prof. H. R. Kapadia has published a *History of Jain Canon* which the present author has not yet seen.

The post-canonical works of the Jains in Prākrit are really extensive and the greatest task of Prākrit-Studies at this moment is to see that most of it is published. Before 1900, much of it was not known and only some late and small works, exclusively of the narrative type were fully edited and published. The first of such works was Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, giving the stories of Jain prophets and some other popular tales, in easy prose and verse and intended as the first reading book for students of Prākrit, which purpose it serves well even to-day. Before this he had already published the story of *Kālaka* (ZDMG, 1880)

with an introduction dealing with the historical importance of the tale. Two other versions of the same story were edited by Leumann in 1883. As early as 1879 Klatt has published the ornate poem *Ṛsabhapañcāśikā* of Dhanapāla. A work of dogmatic contents the *Jītakalpa* of Jinabhadra was edited by Leumann in 1892 along with the Prākrit *Bhāṣya* of Siddhasena. The same scholar began to publish his collection of *Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen* (ZDMG, 1897) but he had to give it up for lack of Mss. In 1902 Guérinot edited the small tract *Jīvaviyāra* of Śāntisūri while the Prākrit epic of Hemachandra, the *Kumārapālacarita* was edited by S. P. Pandit (in BSS, 1900). Pavolini edited the small Prākrit didactic tract called *Praśnottaramālā* (1898).

More voluminous works were soon given out. The Jain version of the story of Rāma called *Paümacariya* was edited by H. Jacobi and published at Bhavanagar (1914). The work extends over 9000 gāthās. It is important on account of its early date which cannot be later than the second century A. D. It is to be regretted that the critical notes and the introduction of the editor were never published and from his remarks about the Mss. in his introduction to *Bhavisattakahā*, it is clear that they are of great importance as regards the language. An anthology of Prākrit verses on the model of *Sattasaī* and compiled by Jayavallabha was published by J. Laber (Calcutta, 1914). A romantic story called the *Surasundarīcariya* was edited by Muni Rajavijaya (Benares, 1916) with an elaborate preface in Sanskrit and some good foot-notes on difficult words. In the same series was published the voluminous *Supāsanāhacariya* (Benares, 1918) by H. D. Seth in three parts and accompanied by a Sanskrit chāyā. A big çollection of interesting stories of Somaprabha called *Kumārapālapratibodha* (GOS, 1920) was edited by Muni Jinavijaya from old Mss. but the critical value of the book is lessened by the vast number of misprints throughout the work. The famous romance of Haribhadra in prose, the *Samarāiccakahā*, was edited by Jacobi (Calcutta, 1926) with a summary in English and an introduction deciding the date of the author. A book of vast dimensions, the prose work *Vasudevahiṇḍī* is edited by Muni Chaturavijaya and Puṇyavijaya (Bhavanagar, 1930) in two parts giving us only a fraction of the whole work. *The story of Kālaka* in many of its versions in Prākrit and Sanskrit was published by W. N. Brown (Washington, 1933) in a really luxurious manner. Many other Prākrit works are being published day by day by a number of Series but really critical editions of many works are yet lacking.

Among works of dogmatic and philosophical contents, worthy of note are the editions of *Sanmatitarka* (Ahmedabad, 1932) by Bechardas and Sukhalal whose Gujarāti commentary is rendered into English. The introduction of this work is a mine of information well presented. The other is the edition of the *Bṛhatkalpa* with its *Bhāṣya* and Sanskrit Ṭīkās edited by Muni Chaturavijaya and Puṇyavijaya and yet in course of publication (Bhavanagar, 1936 foll.)

In the field of technical literature the science of metrics is well represented in Prākrit by a number of works and due to the labours of one scholar, Prof. H. D. Velankar, we now possess good editions of *Vṛttajātisamuccaya* of Virahāṅka (JBBRAS, 1929, 1932), *Gāthālakṣaṇa* of Nanditādhya (ABORI, 1933) *Chandaḥkośa* of Ratnaśekhara (J. Uni. Bom., 1933), *Kavidarpaṇa* (ABORI, 1935) and *Svayambhūcchandas* of Svayambhū (JBBRAS, 1935). These works are valuable not only on account of the theory of prosody they teach but also on account of quotations of Prākrit verses from earlier literature.

The necessity of intensive studies of individual books is keenly felt on account of the great paucity of such works at present available, the more so, as the field of post-canonical Prākrit literature is so varied and vast. Jacobi studied the legend of the burning of Dvāravatī (ZDMG, 1888) where different Jain versions are compared ; Leumann studied the different versions of the story of Citta and Sambhūta (WZKM, 1892) and the Jain accounts of the story of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga were taken note of by Lüders (1901). Similarly J. Charpentier compared the Jain and Buddhist accounts of the *Paccekabuddhageschichten* (Upasala, 1908) and other stories (*Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur*, Leipzig 1908). Dr. P. D. Gune discussed the Jain legend about king Pradyota, Udayana and Śreṇika (ABORI, 1920) and the same was done by Dr. L. Alsdorf in his article *A New Version of the Agaḍadatta story* (NIA, 1938). The *Vasudevahiṇḍi* has also supplied this scholar with traces of the lost *Bṛhatkathā* (*Eine neue Version der verlorenen Bṛhatkathā des Guṇāḍhya*).

An important aspect of the Jain philosophy is thoroughly dealt with by Glasenapp in his ' *Die Lehre vom Karman in der Philosophie der Jainas nach den Karmagranthas dargestellt*' (Leipzig, 1915). The introduction gives information about the different old Karmagranthas and the new ones of Devendra while the main thesis summarises the doctrine with all its details. The vast field of the commentarial literature which has grown round the *Āvaśyakasūtras*

and its *Niryukti* has been well surveyed by Leumann in his posthumous work *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-literature* (Hamburg, 1934) which was published by his pupil Dr W. Schubring. Similarly the two Niryuktis on the *Dasaveyāliya* and *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* are analysed by A. M. Ghatage (IHQ, 1935, 1936). Brief histories of the post-canoncial works may be found in Glasenapp's *Der Jainismus* (Berlin, 1925), Winternitz's *History of Indian Literature* (Calcutta, 1933), and an analysis of published work arranged topic-wise in Schubring's *Die Lehre der Jainas* (Berlin, 1925). Contributions towards such a history may be found in articles by A. M. Ghatage (*Hymns in Prākrit*, J. Uni. Bom., 1934, *Narrative Literature in Jain Māhārāṣṭrī*, ABORI, 1935, *Didactic Works in Prākrit*, J. Uni. Bom., 1937). A comprehensive history of the Prākrit literature is still a desideratum.

The Prākrit literature of the Digambaras is also considerable but not so well-known because of the absence of good editions. The two series, the Māṇikyacandra-Digambara-Jaina-Granthamālā and the Rāyacandra-Jaina-Śāstramālā of Bombay have published many Prākrit works of famous Digambara writers like Vaṭṭakera, Kundakunda, Nemicandra others and many of them are translated into English in the Sacred Books of the Jainas (Arrah, 1917 foll.). Noteworthy among such editions are, the one of the *Dravyasaṁgraha* by Ghoshal and the other of the *Pañcāstikāya* by Chakravarti from the point of view of Jain philosophy. But a really critical edition of a work in Jain Sauraseni is no doubt the *Pravacanasāra* of Kundakunda by Dr. A. N. Upadhye (Bombay, 1935) which collects all the information about the author in the elaborate introduction and adds a translation of the work. A noteworthy feature of the introduction for Prākrit studies is the close analysis of Jain Śaurasenī and its distinctive features and the propriety of its name. A small tract, *The Darśanasāra* of Devasena, is also published by him in ABORI (1934). The vastness of the early Digambara literature is vividly brought to light by the publication of the four volumes of the famous commentary called *Dhavalā* of Vīrasena on the Sūtras called the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, by Prof. H. L. Jain (Amraoti), which is accompained by a Hindī translation and the editor is adding new information culled out from the text in the form of introductory essays. They are works dealing with the dry subject of Karma philosophy but are interesting as supplying many important linguistic facts and glimpses of earlier literature. The other two commentaries, *Jayadhavalā* and *Mahādhavalā* may also be published

soon. An old work called *Tiloyapaṇṇatti* is being edited by Dr. A. N. Upadhye (Jain Ant.).

The youngest branch of Prākrit studies is the publication of Apabhraṁśa literature and the study of its linguistic nature. Its close connection with modern Indian languages and the excellence and extent of its literature make this study both urgent and fascinating. A few years ago our knowledge of Apabhraṁśa was mainly confined to the rules in Hemacandra's grammar and verses cited by him. To these may be added the Apabhraṁśa stanzas in Kālīdāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya* and a few more quoted in the Alaṁkāra works, particularly Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa.* Pischel took stock of all this material in his book *Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṁśa* (Göttingen, 1902).

But a real beginning of Apabhraṁśa studies must be dated from the time of publication by Dr. H. Jacobi, of his edition of the first extensive work, the *Bhavisattakaha,* of Dhanapāla (München, 1918). The introduction to this work laid the foundation of all further studies in this field. Besides collecting information about the author, giving the contents of the story and other related matter, Jacobi discussed thoroughly the nature of the Apahhraṁśa language and pointed out its importance for modern languages. To the text was added a full glossary. A few years later he also published a part of Haribhdra's *Nemināhacariu,* called *Saṇaṅkumāracariu* (München, 1921) to which he supplied some more information about the language, a full translation and glossaries. But above all, he pointed out that the language of this work differed from the earlier one and thus demonstrated that Apabhraṁśa literature showed dialectal differences. Soon Dalal and Gune published another edition of the *Bhavisayattakahā* (GOS, 1923) which supplied some of the gaps of Jacobi's edition but otherwise showed no merit. In the introduction, Dr. Gune gave a list of Apabhraṁśa works then known. The great extent of Apabhraṁśa literature was brought into prominence by Rai Bahadur Hiralal in his *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prākrit Mss. in the Central Provinces and Berar* (Nagpur, 1926). Small poems in Apabhraṁśa were also published by Gune (*Sañjamamañjarī,* ABORI), Velankar(*Vairāgyaśataka,* ABORI) and Modi(*Bhāvanāsandhi,* ABORI). Three such works of Jinadatta were edited by L. B. Gandhi (GOS, 1927) to which an introduction in Sanskrit was added by him and which touched a number of points about the language. Another type of Apabhraṁśa, the so-called eastern dialect, is represented by the *Dohākośas* of Kāṇha and Saraha which were first discovered by

Haraprasadaśastri and are edited by M. Shahidullah (Paris, 1928) which edition also contains a few gānas in Old Bengali and, as remarked by Alsdorf, the linguistic facts in which must be used with caution. A still new edition of the same works is given out by Dr P. C. Bagchi (Calcutta, 1939).

The considerable Apabhraṁśa material in the *Kumārapāla-pratibodha* was studied critically by Dr. L. Alsdorf in his book on that work (Hamburg, 1928) and he later published his magnificent edition of the *Harivaṁśapurāṇa* which forms a small part of the extensive *Mahāpurāṇa* of Puṣpadanta (Hamburg, 1936). The edition gives with unsurpassed thoroughness all the material about the language and deals with the story in all its Jain versions. The same scholar has further published a number of his essays dealing with the grammar and metres of Apabhraṁśa under the title *Apabhraṁśa Studien* (Leipzig, 1937), which supply many interesting points for consideration.

In 1931 Prof. H. L. Jain founded two series at Karanja for the publication of a number of Apabhraṁśa works many of which were found in the Karanja Bhandar. Thus appeared the *Jasaharacariu* of Puṣpadanta (1931) edited by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, the *Sāvayadhammadohā* attributed to Devasena (1932), the *Pāhuḍadoha* of Rāmasiṁha (1933),the *Karakaṇḍacariu* of Kanakāmara(1934)and the *Nāyakumāracariu* of Puṣpadanta (1933) all edited by Prof. H. L. Jain and all model editions supplying necessary information useful to both scholars and students. The biggest Apabhraṁśa work yet published is, no doubt, the edition of *Mahāpurāṇa* of Puṣpadanta in three volumes which has been prepared with patience by Dr. P. L. Vaidya (Bombay, 1937 foll.) In the different introductory essays the editor has given valuable information which, however, lacks a good plan because of its being distributed in three places. The text is based on good old Mss. and is constituted on sound critical principles. Another important addition to Apabhraṁśa literature is the publication of the philosophical poem, the *Paramappapayāsu* of Joindu (Bombay, 1937) edited by Dr. A. N. Upadhye who has also contributed an exhaustive introductory essay on the date, works and philosophy of the author. In the appendix is published another small tract of the author, the *Yogasāra* of similar contents. A good reader for students of this language is the *Apabhraṁśapāṭhāvali* by M. C. Modi (Ahmedabad, 1935) which gives a sketch of Apabhraṁśa grammar and extracts, some of which are taken from unpublished books. Muni Jinavijaya has undertaken an edition of

Saṁdeśarāsaka in Bhāratīya Vidyā. An interesting fact about the work is that it is written by a Mahomedan writer, Abdul Rahamana. With this fulness of the sources the time is ripe for an intensive study of both Apabraṁśa grammar and literature on approved lines.

Collection of Mss. and descriptive calatogues of these collections is the very basis of all further research and it is difficult to overstate their importance. The early catalogues of Bhandarkar, Kielhorn, Peterson are valuable even now. Of special value for Prākrit studies are further the catalogues of Mss. in *Jesalmere Bhandars* (GOS, 1923), of Mss. in the library of the *Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society* by Velankar (1925, 1930), of Mss. in *Central Provinces and Berar* by Hiralal (1926), of *India Office* by Keith (Oxford, 1935), of *Jain Mss. of the BORI* by H. R. Kapadia in three volumes (Poona, 1935, 1936, 1940) and of Mss. in *Pattan* by L. B. Gandhi (GOS, 1927). Finally we may note that a comprehensive catalogue of all the Jain Mss. called *Jinaratnakośa* by Prof. H. D. Velankar is in course of publication at BORI. It will be soon out and be of immense use to Prākrit scholars.

Many years ago A. Guèrinot began a very useful work in his *Essai de bibliographie Jaina* (Paris, 1906) in which he classified and and described the contents of all the publications upto date and later added a supplement (JA, 1909) bringing the work upto 1909. It is unfortunate that the work was discontinued. With the growing extent of the Prākrit studies, such bibliographical works must be undertaken to help rapid progress of the studies.

I must close this brief sketch with a personal note. I here acknowledge the help I received from Dr. A. N. Upadhye and Dr. R. N. Dandekar and must put forth the excuse of limited space and time as also of the poor library facilities at my disposal for the absence of any indication of many an important work in the Prākrit field which, unfortunately, I may not have been in a position to peruse.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE WORK DONE IN THE FIELD OF CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE DURING THE LAST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS

BY

HAR DUTT SHARMA†

At the outset I should like to state that the disturbed international situation and several other causes have been a very great handicap in the preparation of this article. The few learned journals and books which I could have access to, in this Imperial city of Delhi, had to be packed away and removed to safer places before I could consult them. Hence, none is more conscious of several inaccuracies which might have crept in here. Many important scholars and their works may have escaped my attention. However, I am putting forth the facts as far as they came under my notice.

All through this article I have very much depended upon the information supplied and the arrangement given in the excellent *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature* by Kāvyavinoda, Sāhityaratnākara M. Krishnamachariar, M. A., M. L., Ph. D., Madras, 1937.

Amongst the several Mahākāvyas that have seen the light of print the following deserve notice.

(1) *Rāṣṭrauḍhavaṃśa*[1] of Rudra Kavi which describes the history of Bāgulas of Mayūragiri, from Rāṣṭrauḍha, king of Kanouj and the originator of the dynasty to Nārāyaṇa Shāh of Mayūragiri, composed in 1596 A. D.

(2) *Vasantavilāsa*[2] of Bālacandra Sūri, describing king Vastupāla's life and history of Gujarat, composed in 1240 A. D.

† A pathetic interest attaches to the publication of this article. At my special request, Dr. Har Dutt Sharma prepared, for this volume, this paper—alas, his last!—dealing with the important work done in the field of Classical Sanskrit Studies during the last twenty-five years. But unfortunately he has not lived to see it in print. Dr. Har Dutt Sharma died at Delhi unexpectedly on 11th September 1942, at the young age of 43. The excellent work done by him in the field of Oriental research bears ample testimony to his wide interest, great industry and exact scholarship. In him Indology has lost a very devoted and promising worker.—R. N. D.

1. Ed. by E. Krishnamacharya and C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1917.
2. Ed. by C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1917.

(3) *Rāmacarita*[3] of Abhinanda, which belongs to the earlier part of the 9th century A. D.

(4) *Sāhityaratnākara*[4] of Yajñanārāyaṇa Dīkṣita, in sixteen cantos. The poem deals with the exploits of Raghunātha Nāyaka (17 century A. D.), king of Tanjore,

(5) *Pṛthvīrājavijayamahākāvyam*[5] of Jayāṅka, with the commentary of Jonarāja.

L. P. Pandeya Śarmā informs us about a *Kosalānandamahākāvya*, a historical poem of Gaṅgādhara Miśra, dealing with the Chauhan rulers of Patna cum Sambhalpur kingdoms.[6]

D. R. Mankad has brought to light a small poem of twenty verses, called *Buddhivinodakāvya*, a *paryāya-kāvya*, with the commentary of Kālidāsa.[7]

M. P. L. Sastry informs us about Bhoganātha, a poet of the 14th century A. D.[8] Bhoganātha was a younger brother of Mādhava and Sāyaṇa and the author of at least six works :—

(i) *Mahāgaṇapatistotra*, (ii) *Gaurīnāthaśataka*, (iii) *Udāharaṇamālā*, (iv) *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*, (v) *Tripuravijaya* and (vi) *Rāmollāsa*.

Pāṇini,[9] the great grammarian is reputed to be a poet also. A list of verses scattered in various anthologies as ascribed to him have been collected by F. W. Thomas in his introduction to *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya*.[10] Bhandarkar does not accept the indentity of the author of these verses with the celebrated grammarian.[11] About the two works *Jāmbavatīvijaya* and *Pātālavijaya* ascribed to Pāṇini, Kshitish Chandra Chatterjee has entered into a discussion and arrived at the conclusion that they are not from the pen of the great grammarian. *Jāmbavatīvijaya* belongs to about the 9th century A. D.[12]

---

3. Ed. by K. S. Rangaswami Sastri, GOS, Baroda, 1930; cf. JOR, Madras, III, 57, ff. which contains a learned discussion on the identification of Devapāla with Hāravarṣa Yuvarājadeva.
4. Ed. by T. R. Chintamani, Madras, 1932.
5. Ed. by Gauri Shankar Hirachand Ojha, Ajmer, 1941.
6. J. Bih. Or. R. S., XX ii, June, 1934.
7. Edited in IHQ, 1936, 691 ff.
8. IHQ, 1941, 393 ff.
9. On dates of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, see IA, XLVII, 112, 138; on the word *Śramaṇas* mentioned in his grammar, see IA, L, 82. For general information about him, see Belvalkar's Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.
10. See p. 51 ff.
11. JBRAS, XVI, 344 ff.
12. Cal. Or. J., I, i (Oct. 1933).

Vararuci,[13] according to the following verse ascribed to Rājaśekhara[14] :—

यथार्थता कथं नाम न स्याद्वररुचेरिह ।
व्यधत्त **कण्ठाभरणं** यः सदारोहणप्रियः ॥

is alleged to have written a poem called *Kaṇṭhābharaṇa.* Bhoja also quotes a verse (*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, XI) ascribed to Vararuci.[15]

Along with several editions of the works of Kālidāsa, much has been written about the poet himself, his birth-place, his poetry and his works.[16] Sufficient light has been thrown on the various com-

---

13. Belvalkar (Syt. Sans. Gram., 29,) gives his date 500–850, B. C. But Bhandarkar and R. Mukarjee (IA, LVI, 21) assign 350 B. C. See also Jayaswal (IA, XLVII, 112, 138).

14. Jalhaṇa's Sūktimuktāvali, GOS, Baroda, p. 43, verse 46.

15. M. Krishnamachariar, HSL, p. 88.

16. See IA, XLVII, 264, where his birth-place is fixed at Dasapura in Malwa, by Majumdar; A. C. Chattarjee : *Kālidāsa, his poetry and mind,* says that it was Ujjain. See Thomas : JRAS, 1918, p. 118 ; Kṣetreśa Chandra Cattopādhyāya, *All. Univ. Studies*, II, 80 ff. ; A. Hillebrandt : *Kālidāsa*, Breslau, 1921 ; S. K. De : *Kālidāsa*, IHQ, 1940, 385 ff. ; K. G. Shankar : *The Date of Kālidasa—58 B. C.*, IHQ, 1925, 309 ff. ; In *The authorship of the Nalodaya*, A S. Ramanatha Ayyar (JRAS, 1925) says that *Nalodaya* is not a work of Kālidāsa, but of the Kerala poet Vāsudeva, son of Ravi, who lived in the courts of the Cera king Kulaśekhara and his successor Rāma in the first half of the 9th century A. D. ; S. K. Belvalkar, in Asia Major (vol. II, pt. i) discusses the application of a few canons of textual and higher criticism to Kālidāsa's *Śakuntala* ; V. V. Gokhale : *The Maṅgalāṣṭaka of Kālidāsa* ; In the article *Kālidāsa and Music,* G. N. Mujumdar propounds that the poet had knowledge of music (vocal and instrumental) and dancing. He gives the lists of technical terms on music occurring in Kālidāsa's works and of songs in his plays—Annals (BORI), 1925-26, VII, pts i—ii ; On the basis of the political condition referred to in the *Raghu VI* D. R. Bhandarkar concludes that the poet could not have lived during the reign of Candragupta II or Skandagupta, but must have flourished in the 6th century A. D.—Annals, VIII, pt. ii ; Lacchmi Dhar assigns Kālidāsa to Kashmir in his *The Birthplace of Kālidāsa* (Delhi, 1926) ; In his *Padmapurāṇa and Kālidāsa* (Cal. O. S., No. 17, 1923) Har Dutt Sharma propounds that the poet is indebted to the *Padmapurāṇa* for his stories of *Raghu* and *Śāk* ; In his article *Kālidāsa in China* (IHQ, 1933, 829-834), Louis Finot informs us of a single palmleaf Ms. preserved in the Buddhist monastery of Che-kiang province in China, containing references to the legendary life of Kālidāsa, with quotations from his poems. But the above is disputed by Sten Konow (IHQ, 1934, 566 ff.); K. S. Ramaswami Sastri : *Kālidāsa, His Period, Personality and Poetry* (Vāṇīvilāsa Press, Srirangam, 1934); In Sāhityapariṣatpatrikā (Bengali) XLI, No. 2, Prabodh Chandra Sen Gupta arrives at the date of Kālidāsa on astronomical data as 6th century A. D. ; In *Kālidāsa and the Hūṇas* (Jour. Ind. His., XV, pt. I, April 1936), K. C. Chattopādhyāya points out that Kālidāsa's mention of the Hūṇas in *Raghu* does not prove that the poet could not have lived before the 5th century A. C., because the Hiung-nu, as the Hūṇas were known in China, had occupied the banks of the Oxus in the 1st century B. C. ; Bhagawat Saran Upadhyaya : *Education and Learning as depicted by Kālidāsa, and Fine Arts as depicted by Kālidāsa* (Jour. B. Hind. Uni., IV, 1-3) ; V. Rāghavan : *Women Characters in Kālidāsa's dramas* (Annals of Or. Res. Uni. Madras, IV, 1939-40, pt. 2) ; C. Kunhan Raja : *Studies in Kālidāsa*, Ibid, V, pt. 2, 1940-41. See also Krishnamachariar's HSL, 590, fn. 2.

mentaries and commentators[17] of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, as well as the nature of its poetry.[18] The *Meghadūta* has also seen several editions and two more translations in foreign languages[19] have appeared recently. A. S. Bhandarkar[20] has thrown a suggestion on the possible identification of the mount Devagiri mentioned in the *Megha* with the mountain Devaguraḍā, about six miles south-east of Indore.

Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* has given rise to several Dūta-kāvyas[21] in Sanskrit literature, several of which have been published.[22]

Like his other works, Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* has been profusely commented by commentators.[23] P. K. Gode draws our attention to *Devasenā* of Haricaraṇadāsa, composed about 1630-80 A. D.,[24] the date of Cāritravardhana about 1172-1385 A. D., and *Śabdāmṛta* of Kāyastha Gopāl, son of Balabhadra, composed in the middle of the 15th century A. D.[25] There are different opinions as to whether Vallabha, the commentator on Kālidāsa's works, is to be identified with the anthologist Vallabha or not, S. K. De holding the latter opinion.[26] S. Sundarachar has described the humour[27]

17. See Krishnamachariar's HSL, 116 ff.

18. A. C. Subrahmanyam: *Nature Poetry in Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṁśa*, J. Anna. Uni., III, Oct. 1934, and IV, Jan. 1935; D. T. Tatacharya: *The First Verse of Raghuvaṁśa*, III Or. Conf., Madras.

19. Translated into English, with transliterated text and notes by G. H. Rooke, London, 1935; *Meghadūta and Ṛtusaṁhāra of Kālidāsa*, Text and French translation by R. H. Assier de Pompignan, Paris, 1938.

20. IA, 1928, Jan.

21. Chintaharan Chakravarti: *Origin and development of Dūtakāvya literature in Sanskrit*, IHQ, 1927, 273 ff. He names about 48 works of this type and mentions three *Haṁsasaṁdeśas* (i) by Vedāntadeśika—Veṅkaṭeśa, (ii) by Bhaṭṭa Vāmana, and (iii) anonymous; see also E.P. Radhakrishnan: *Some More Dūtakāvyas in Sanskrit*, JOR, Madras, XIII, pt. i, (Jan--March, 1939) where he mentions a dozen more imitations of the *Megha*.

22. *Haṁsasaṁdeśa*, ed. by K. Sambasiva Sastri, Triv. S. S., 1938; *Bhṛṅgadūta* of Kṛṣṇadeva, ed. by S. P. Chaturvedi, Nag. Uni. Journal, No. 3; *Bhramaradūta* of Rudra Nyāyapañcānana (about 17th cent. A. D.), ed. by J. B. Chaudhuri, Calcutta, 1940; *Vāṅmaṇḍana-guṇadūta* of Vīreśvara, and *Candradūta* of Jambūkavi, ed. by J. B. Chaudhuri, Cal. 1941; *Pavanadūta* of Dhoyin, ed. by Chintaharan Chakravarti, Calcutta.

23. See Krishnmachariar's HSL, p. 119 f.

24. Annals, XIII, pt. II.

25. Annals, XV, Oct. Jan. 1934.

26. JRAS, 1927, 471-7, and Ibid, 1928, 403; see also D. C. Bhattacharya, JRAS, 1928, 135.

27. JOR, Madras, V, pt. i, 1932.

found in the *Kumāra*, and Sivaprasada Bhattacharya has discussed in detail the question whether the cantos 9–22 of the poem are by Kālidāsa or not.[28]

F. W. Thomas has given a complete list of Aśvaghoṣa's works with references in his introduction to *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* (25–29). There is little doubt that the poet was greatly influenced by the *Kāvya* style of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*.[29] E. Hultzsch[30] finds references to traces of influence of Aśvaghoṣa in Subandhu, Bāṇa and Daṇḍin, and G. Tucci[31] refers to the poet's influence on Vasubandhu and Hemacandra. A. B. Keith[32] and M. Winternitz[33] give a critical account of his works and style. A new and uptodate addition of the *Buddhacarita* with an English translation by E. H. Johnston appeared from Lahore in 1936. C. W. Gurner[34] and E. H. Johnston[35] have contributed to the textual criticism of the poem. A re-issue of Haraprasad Shastri's edition of *Saundarānanda* with additions by Chintaharan Chakravarti appeared in Bibliotheca Indica Series from Calcutta in 1939. In the bibliography attached to this edition, Chakravarti gives a complete list of articles, etc. on the poem contributed by various scholars from 1905 to 1933.

No new edition of Kumāradāsa's *Jānakīharaṇa* seems to have appeared recently. According to S. Paramaratna[36] the poet is mentioned in the *Mahāvaṁśa*. M. Doraswamayya considers that as Kumāradāsa quotes an author of the 6th century A. D., he cannot be placed earlier than this date. But K. K. Krishnamacharya differs from him.[37]

The controversy about the identity of Bhaṭṭi, the author of *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, with Vatsabhaṭṭi or Bhartṛhari has not yet reached its

---

28. Fourth Or. Con., Allahabad.

29. C. W. Gurner: JASB, new series, XXIII, 3; The same author makes a study of the psychological simile in Aśvaghoṣa in JASB, XXVI, 1930, (175–180) ;

30. *Zu Aśvaghoṣha's Saundarananda*, ZDMG, Band 73, 1919, 229–32.

31. *Note sul Saundaranandakāvya di Aśvaghoṣha*, Revista degli Studi Orientali, 1923, X, 145-9.

32. Classical Sanskrit Literature, 1936, 24–5 ; A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1928, 56 ff.

33. A History of Indian Literature (Eng. Trans.), 1933, II, 262–4.

34. JASB, 1926, No. 1.

35. JRAS, April 1927.

36. See his letter to M. Krishnamachariar published in the latter's HSL, 135, fn. 2.

37. Journal of Tirumalai Śrī Veṅkaṭeśvara, I, No. 5 (Dec. 1932).

final stage,[38] and scholars differ also on the question of the relative priority of Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha,[39] which is raised by the *Alaṁkaras* illustrated in the X canto of *Bhaṭṭikāvya.*[40]

S. K. De assigns Bhāravi to the 6th or the 7th century A. D.[41] Tradition says that Bhāravi's other name was Dāmodara; but according to Harihara Śāstri,[42] they were different and Dāmodara secured the friendship of his patron king Viṣṇuvardhana through the medium of Bhāravi.

About Māgha there are two important contributions, one by E. Hultzsch,[43] who tries to arrive at Māgha's date on the basis of the commentaries of Vallabha and Mallinātha, and the other by Dasaratha Sarma,[44] who opines that statecraft, military equipment and military custom described in Māgha are an accurate reflection of the surroundings of the poet in the 8th century A. D.

Though several editions of Śrī Harṣa's *Naiṣadhīyacarita* have appeared in full or parts and with different commentaries, yet the most important contribution is that of Principal Handiqui who has rendered this difficult poem into English[45] and added critical notes to it.

S. K. De is responsible for bringing out excellant editions of Nītivarman's *Kīcakavadha,*[46] the *Padyāvalī*[47] of Rūpagosvāmin, and the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta*[48] of Bilvamaṅgala or Kṛṣṇa-Līlāśuka. A. Govinda Wariyar says that of the three Bilvamaṅgalas whom he mentions (IHQ, VII, 334), the first, the founder of the Mutt, wrote *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* and lived in the 9th century and the author of

---

38. A. B. Keith: Classical Sanskrit Literature, 53; Jacobi: Sitz. d. preuss. Akad., 1922, p. 216.

39. Jacobi; ZDMG. LXIV; Sitz. d. preuss. Akad., 1922, 210-3; Keith: Sanskrit Literature, 51; S. K. De: Sanskrit Poetics, I, 50; H. R. Divekar, JRAS, 1924, 830; M. Winternitz: Gesch. d. i. L., III, 70-72, 402.

40. JRAS, 1929, 830 ff.

41. IHQ, I, 31 and III, 162; See also A. Rangaswami Saraswati: *The Age of Bhāravi and Daṇḍin,* J. My., 670-88; JOR. Madras, 1927, 193.

42. IHQ, III, 169.

43. Asia Major, Vol. II, pt. i.

44. *Gleanings from Sanskrit Mahākāvyas,* Journ. Ind. His., Dec. 1929.

45. Published by Motilal Banarsi Dass, Lahore.

46. Dacca Univ. Series, 1929; See also his article in JRAS, 1929, 109.

47. Dacca Univ. Series, 1934.

48. Ibid, 1938.

Puruṣakāra[49] was a different and later person who lived in the 13th century A. D. In an article,[50] K. R. Pisharoti says that Kṛṣṇa-Lilāśuka, author of the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta*, is the foremost among the Kerala Sanskrit writers with the name of Kṛṣṇa. Villamaṅgalam (not Vilva°) was the designation of his family. Pisharoti has given an account of the lives and works of the different authors bearing this name.

Jagannātha's *Bhāminīvilāsa* has also seen several editions in full[51] and parts recently.

J. B. Chaudhari deserves special mention for his contribution on the Sanskrit Poeteses,[52] which he is publishing in a series from Calcutta, the first volume being out in 1941.

The position of *Pañcatantra* in modern Indian folk-lore has received special attention at the hands of W. Norman Brown.[53] Keith[54] rejects the 2nd century A. D. as the date of this work on the evidence of the word *Dīnāra* used in it. Scholars are of opinion that the author of *Pañcatantra* not only mentions Cāṇakya as a writer on *nṛpa-śāstra* or *Nīti-śāstra*, but also gives verbatim quotations wrongly and sometimes rightly from the *Arthaśāstra* in support of his views.[55] Keith[56] examines in detail the *Pañcatantra* of Pūrṇabhadra, the *Pañcākhyānoddhāra* of Meghavijaya and *Tantrākhyāyika*.[57]

We are glad to note that M. B. Emeneau[58] has brought out an edition of Jambhaladatta's version of *Vetālapañcaviṁśati*, and A. A. M. Shrpé of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.[59]

---

49. A philosophical work attributed to Bilvamaṅgala, edited by T. Ganapati Sastri, in Triv. S. S.

50. *Kṛṣṇas of Kerala*, Bull. Rāmavarma R. I., July 1938.

51. Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay, 1933; ed. by Har Dutt Sharma with a Sanskrit Comm., Eng. Trans., Poona, 1938.

52. See also H. C. Chakaldar: *Ancient Indian Poetesses*, fourth article in the Sir Ashutosh Comm. Vol., I, pt. ii; V. Raghavan: *Sanskrit and Prākrit Poetesses*, J. Myth. S., XXV, pts. 1-3 (July 1934—Jan. 1935).

53. JAOS, XXXIX, 1.

54. Sanskrit Literature, 245 ff.; JRAS, 1925, 504.

55. Mys. Arch. Rep., 1927, 16.

56. Sanskrit Literature, 260; see also A. Venkatasubbiah: *Pañcatantra Studies*, Asia Major, III, fasc. III & IV; Annals, XV, pts.i and ii, Oct. Jany. 1934.

57. Ed. by Hertel in HOS, Vol. 14; see also Zachariae: *Kleine Schriften* 170; Winternitz: VOJ, XXIV, 49; A. Venkatasubbiah: *On the Titles Pañcatantra and Tantrākhyāyikā*, IHQ, 1937, 668 ff. On the question of *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā*, see S. K. De, Bull. Sch. Or. St., London, III, 1924, 507-17.

58. New Haven, Connecticut, 1934.

59. Leuven, 1937.

On the question whether Dandin, the author of *Daśakumāracarita*, is the author of *Avantīsundarīkathā*[60] or not, S. K. De holds the latter view.[61]

Whether Subandhu, the author of *Vāsavadattā*, is earlier or later than Bhāmaha, is an intriguing question. Some are of opinion that Subandhu's version of *Vāsavadattā* is quite different from that which Bhāmaha criticises as *loka-śāstra-viruddha*. It never existed in Bhāmaha's time. If it had existed he would not have failed to notice it in this connection.[62] R. V. Krishnamachariar, the editor of the *Vāsavadattā* in the Vāṇīvilāsa series, holds that Bāṇa is earlier than Subandhu. But this opinion has been disproved by S. P. Bhattacharya.[63] Manmohan Ghosh[64] has tried to establish Bengal as the home of Subandhu. The passage in Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti*, mentioning Candragupta and Subandhu, does not refer to Vasubandhu or the Gupta period.[65] The question about the date of Subandhu and his identity with the ancient writer on dramaturgy and the Mauryan minister of that name has been discussed by A. Rangaswami Sastri[66] but he arrives at no definite conclusion. P. K. Gode has examined the question of the different commentaries[67] of Vāsavadattā and their dates, and arrives at the conclusion that Nārāyaṇa's commentary in Ms. form is between 1250–1550 A. D.

The *Udayanasundarīkathā*[68] was composed by Soḍḍhala between 1026 and 1050 A. D. He was patronised by the rulers of Konkan. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh[69] has tried to study the historical facts, specially about the *Kāyasthas*, in this work. He arrives at the conclusion that the *Kāyastha* caste originated in the 8th century of the Christian era. Soḍḍhala calls himself a *Kāyastha* and also claims to be a *Kṣatriya*.

---

60. Ed. by R. Kavi in *Dakṣiṇābhāratī Series*. See also J. Nobel: *Die Avantīsundarīkathā*, Zeit. Ind. Iran., V, iii.
61. IHQ, III, 161; See also S. K. De: *Bhāravi and Daṇḍin*, IHQ, 1925, 31-36; S. Pattabhiram's paper, *Ācārya Daṇḍin as a Critic*, Orient. Conf., Madras, 1924.
62. Mys. Arch. Rep., 1927, p. 25.
63. IHQ, 1929, 699 ff.
64. IHQ, 1939, 472 ff.
65. IA, 1924.
66. IHQ, I, 261 ff.
67. Annals, XXI, pts. i and ii; see also Gray: *Śivarāma's Commentary on Vāsavadattā*, JAOS, XXIV, 57-63.
68. Ed. by C. D. Dalal and E. Krishnamacharya, GOS, Baroda, 1920.
69. Annals, XIII, pts. iii & iv.

Amongst the *Campūs*, mention may be made of *Ānandakanda-campū*[70] of Mitramiśra, the author of *Vīramitrodaya*, *Ajāmilamokṣa-prabandha*[71] of Nārayāṇabhaṭṭa, composed in the 16th century, *Yuddhakāṇḍacampū*[72] of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita, the father-in-law of Appayya Dīkṣita, composed in 1636 A. D., and *Citra Campū*[73] of Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṁkāra, composed in 1744 A. D. V. Raghavan describes[74] the *Virūpākṣavasantotsavacampū* of Ahobala. It is of importance to the students of the history of Vijayanagara.

In the domain of dramatic literature, the following are the important ones that have recently seen the light of print.

(1) *Pārthaparākrama*[75] of Prahlādana, belonging to the 12th century A. D.

(2) *Rūpakaṣaṭkam*[76] of Vatsarāja, minister of Paramardideva of Kalanjar, about the second half of the 12th and the first half of the 13th century A. D.

(3) *Mohaparājaya*,[77] an allegorical drama of Yaśaḥpāla, dealing with the conversion of Kumārapāla to Jainism, and composed about 1230 A. D.

(4) *Hammīramardana*[78] of Jayasiṁhasūri, glorifying the two brothers Vastupāla and Tejāḥpāla, and their king Vīradhavala of Dholka.

(5) *Nalavilāsa*[79] of Rāmacandrasūri, pupil of Hemacandrasūri, on the lives of Nala and Damayanti.

(6) *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*[80] of Śaktibhadra

---

70. Ed. in the Saras. Bh. Text Series, Benares.

71. Ed. by V. Venkatarāma Śarmā Śāstri, Bull. Sch. Or. St., London, Vol. IV, pt. II.

72. Ed. by T. R. Chintamani in IHQ, 1930, 629 ff.

73. Ed. by Ramcharan Chakravarti, Benares, 1940.

74. JOR, Madras, XIV, pt. 1.

75. Ed. by C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1917.

76. Ed. by C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1918.

77. Ed. by Muni Caturavijaya and C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1918.

78. Ed. by C. D. Dalal, GOS, Baroda, 1920.

79. Ed. by G. K. Shrigondekar and L. B. Gandhi, GOS, Baroda, 1926.

80. Ed. by S. Kuppuswami Sastri, Madras. R. Vasudeva Sarma (Hindu, Madras, 2nd Feb. 1927) summarises the views of S. Kuppuswami Sastri on the connection between Saktibhadra and Bhāsa's plays. See also K. A. Pisharoti: *Bhāsa's Works. Are they genuine?* Bull. Sch. Or. St., Lond., III, 107-117.

(7) *Tāpasavatsarāja*[81] of Māyurāja. The author was also called Mātrrāja-Anaṅgaharṣa, and was a Kālacūri king of Cedi, with his capital at Māhiṣmatī. His other work is *Udāttarāghava*.[82]

(8) *Mārtaṇḍavijayam*,[83] in five acts, of Devarāja, son of Śeṣādri, settled in Travancore, and the court-poet of Mārtaṇḍavarman belonging to 1729–1758 A. D.

(9) *Dharmavijaya*[84] of Bhūdeva Śukla, the author of *Rasa-vilāsa*, composed about 1550 A. D.[85]

(10) *Mṛgāṅkalekhā*[86] of Viśvanātha.

(11) *Manonurañjananāṭakam*.[87]

(12) *Karpūramañjarī*.[88]

(13) *Jīvānandanam*[89] of Ānandarāyamakhin.

With the publication of the text of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* in Kāvyamālā Series (1894), questions on dramaturgy received greater attention at the hands of scholars[90]. The edition soon became out of print, and it was after about 32 years that M. R. Kavi brought out the first volume of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* with the *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinavagupta in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda (1926). This was followed by *Bhāratīya Nāṭyaśāstra* in Marathi by Godavari Vasudeva Ketkar[91]. But, still, a complete edition of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* was nowhere available. This gap was filled by Baṭukanātha Śarmā and Baladeva Upādhyāya, who brought out a new edition, based on the study of newer Ms. material, in the Kashi Sanskrit Series (Benares, 1929). The second volume of M. R. Kavi's

---

81. Ed. by M. R. Kavi, Madras.

82. See M. R. Kavi, J. Audh. H. S., 1927, I, 155; Bhaṭṭanātha Swami, IA, XLI, 139.

83. Trivan. S. S., Tanjore.

84. Saras. Bh. Text Series, Benares.

85. P. K. Gode, Annals, XIII, pt. II.

86. Saras. Bh. Text Series, Benares.

87. Ed. by M. D. Sastri, Saras. Bh. Text Series, Benares, 1938.

88. Ed. Manmohan Ghosh, Cal. Univ., 1940.

89. Adyar Library Bull., V.

90. P. V. Ramanujaswami: *Vidūṣaka in Sanskrit Plays*, Or. Conf., Madras, 1924; S. K. De: *The Sanskrit Drama*, published in the Cultural Heritage of India, III, 652–669; S. K. De: *A Note on the Sanskrit Monologue Play (Bhāṇa), with special reference to Caturbhāṇī*, JRAS, Jan. 1926.

91. Aryabhushan Press, Poona, 1928.

edition was published in 1934. We are anxiously waiting for the publication of the further volume or volumes. Three more texts of importance on dramaturgy have appeared :—

(1) *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*[92] of Rāmacandra and Gaṅgācandra, composed between 1150–1170 A. D.[93]

(2) *Abhinayadarpaṇa*[94] of Nandikeśvara.

(3) *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakoṣa*[95] of Sāgaranandin.

In an article H. R. Divekar[96] propounds that a dramatic performance in India had to be completed within a prescribed period of time calculated by means of *udaka-nālikā* or water-clock as described in the *Nāṭyaśāstra.* Monoranjan Ghosh[97] draws attention to the *Nāṭyaśāstra* legend about the origin of *Nāṭya*, and to the facts that the word *bharata*, meaning an actor, is not derived from the name of any person, that Śilālin and Kṛśāśva were the earliest known writers of any *Nāṭyaśāstra*, and that Bharata and Ādibharata are different.[98] Studies on the various aspects of *Nāṭyaśāstra* such as its date[99], the position of stage[100], the condition of Hindu Theatre,[101], the types

92. Ed. by G. K. Srigondekar, GOS, Baroda, 1929.

93. P. K. Gode, in Jaina Vidyā, I, No. 1, July 1941.

94. Ed. by Manmohan Ghosh, Calcutta, 1934. Edited with Bengali Translation by Asoknath Sastri, Calcutta, 1938.

95. Ed. by Myles Dillon, Vol. I, Text, Oxford, 1937.

96. JRAS, 1928.

97. *Problems of Nāṭyaśāstra*, IHQ, 1930, 72 ff.; see its criticism by H. V. Trivedi, in IHQ, 1931, 380 ff., and a reply by Ghosh in IHQ, 1932, 373-5.

98. In *The Bharata and Ādibharata problem, etc.* (Annals, 1931, XIII, pt. i) P. K. Gode informs that the copy of Ādibharata's Work in Mysore Library is but a fragment of *Nāṭyaśāstra.* In *The Ādibharata and the Nāṭyasarvasvadīpikā.* (Annals XV, pts. i & ii, Oct.—Jan. 1934), Manmohan Ghosh admits that *Ādibharata* and *Bharata* are not two different works but different recensions of the *Nāṭyaśāstra.*

99. Dinesh Chandra Sircar: *Date of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra*, 5th century A. C.- JAHRS, XII, pt. II.

100. V. Raghvan: *Theatre Architecture in Ancient India*, Triveni, May-June, 1932.

101. D. R. Mankad: *Hindu Theatre* (An interpretation of Bharata's second chapter), IHQ, 1932, 480 ff.; Manmohan Gosh and A. K. Coomarswamy on *Hindu Theatre*, IHQ, 1933, pp. 591 ff. and 594 ff. respectively. Hindu Theatre is again discussed by D. R. Mankad and V. Raghavan in IHQ, 1933, on pp. 973 ff. and 991 respectively. See also R. K. Yajnik's work *The Indian Theatre*: its origin and later development under European influence, London, 1933.

of Drama[102], the influence of Buddhism,[103] etc. have vastly enriched the contributions in the domain of Sanskrit dramaturgy.[104]

The problem of Bhāsa and his works has engaged the attention of scholars at large[105] and various editions of his different works with commentaries and notes have appeared far and wide[106]. It will be similarly difficult to enumerate the editions, translations and studies that have appeared in connection with the dramas of Kālidāsa.

Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭika* has also attracted the attention of various scholars[107] and it has been studied from different angles[108].

The publication of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* of the female poetess Vijjikā or Vijjākā by M. R. Kavi and S. K. Ramanath Sastri has been another epoch-making addition to the dramatic literature. The historical data furnished by the drama have been discussed by

102. See D. R. Mankad's excellent book *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, Karachi, 1936.

103. Keshav Appa Padhye: *Buddhism as depicted in Ancient Sanskrit Dramas*, Ind. Culture, IV, No. 1, July 1937.

104. See also R. V. Jagirdar: *The Doctrinaire Drama* (JRAS of Bengal, I, 1932, No. 2) wherein by an analysis of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, dramatical doctrines contained therein are given. T. K. Rāmchandra Ayyar: *Nāṭyaśāstra-samīkṣā*, Mylapore, 1938. Urmila Dave : *Nāndī in theory*, IHQ, 1941, 359 ff.

105. For a general discussion on Bhāsa's Prakrit, the authenticity of his plays, etc., see Krisnamachariar's HSL, 558, footnotes 6 and 7. An uptodate work dealing with all the aspects of Bhāsa is A. D. Pusalkar's *Bhāsa : A Study*, Lahore, 1937. L. D. Barnett, in *Ābhāsa Bhāsa* says that the plays are not by Bhāsa and are not earlier than the period of Kālidāsa, 5th century A. D.—Bull. Sch. Or. St., London, Vol III, pt. III ; M. Winternitz : *Bhāsa and the Mahābhārata and Kṛṣṇa Plays*, Bull. Rāma Varma R. I., V, pt. i, Jan. 1937 ; Asoka Kumar Bhattacharya : *A Comparative Study of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa*, Ind. Culture, VI, No. 1, July, 1939 ; S. K. De : *The Dramas ascribed to Bhāsa*, IHQ, 1941, 415 ff.

106. Mention may be made of the various dramas of Bhāsa annotated by C. R. Devadhar and published in Poona. Devadhar has brought out a complete collection of the dramas ascribed to Bhāsa in one volume—*Bhāsa-Nāṭaka-Cakram*, Poona, 1937.

107. S. K. De: *The Little Clay-cart* (Indian Review, vol. XXXI, 1930, 105-113); Amongst translations, mention may be made of two in English, one by Revilo Pendleton Oliver, Urbana, 1938, and the other by S. K. Basu, Calcutta University, 1940.

108. See Radhagovinda Basak: *Indian Society as pictured in the Mṛcchakaṭika* —date, before the 4th century A. C., IHQ, 1929, 299 ff. ; H. Lüders : *Daśanāmaka*, a discussion on Vasantasenā's ten names uttered by Śakāra—ZDMG, Band 92, Heft 1.

K. P. Jayaswal at length[109]. Daśaratha Śarmā fixes its date at 340 A. D., and says[110] that a comparison between Kālidāsa and the authoress of the *Kaumudī*° shows that either of the two has borrowed from the other. In a subsequent note[111], Daśaratha Śarmā concludes that Kālidāsa is anterior to the authoress of the drama. In this opinion he is supported by D. R. Mankad[112]. Kshetresha Chandra Chattopadhyaya[113] thinks that the *Kaumudīmahotsava* is not earlier than 700 A. D.

M. R. Kavi laid the scholarly world again under obligation by bringing to light the *Kundamālā*, ascribed to Diṅnāga (or rightly to Dhīranāga). Another edition of the work along with a Sanskrit commentary and English translation was brought out by Jaya-chand Shastri and S. D. Bhanot.[114] An English translation by A. C. Woolner appeared in 1935 from London. The drama belongs to some time earlier than the 5th century A. D.[115], and Har Dutt Sharma suggests[116] that the name of the author should be Vīranāga.

Viśākhadatta composed his *Mudrārākṣasa* in or about 585 A. C., according to the late Dewan Bahadur K. H. Dhruva, the great critic and scholar of Gujerat, who has enriched the Gujarati literature by his translations of Bhāsa's works, *Amaruśataka*, *Gītagovinda*, etc. and who brought out three editions of the *Mudrārākṣasa*[117] with English translation, elaborate introduction and notes. K. H. Dhruva opines that Viśākhadatta appears to have written two other plays, one of them being *Devīcandragupta*[118],

110. *The Kaumudīmahotsava and the date of Kālidāsa*, IHQ, 1934, 763 ff.

109. JBORS, XIX, 113 ff.; again in the *Historical data in the drama Kaumudīmahotsava*, Annals, XII, 50.

111. Published in IHQ, 1935, pp. 478.

112. Annals, XVI, i-ii (Oct.—Jan. 1934-35).

113. *Date of Kaumudīmahotsava*, IHQ, Sep. 1938, 582 ff.

114. Lahore, 1932.

115. On the date of *Kundamālā*, see S. K. De: JRAS, 1924, 663-4; A. C. Woolner: *The date of Kundamālā*, Annals, XV, 1933-34, 236-39; S. K. De in the Annals, XVI, 1934-35, 158.

116. In the review of Woolner's Translation of the work, Annals, XVII, 1936, 311-315.

117. The last edition was published in 1930 from Poona. The date is discussed in the introduction, X ff.

118. See also—V. Raghavan: *The Devīcandragupta* J Ben. Hindu Uni., II, No. 1; Sten Konow: *The Devīcandragupta and its author*, J. Bih. O. R. S. XXIII, pt. iv, Dec. 1937.

and the other probably was based on the Rāmāyaṇa[119]. Another edition of *Mudrārākṣasa* was published by A. Hillebrandt (Breslau, 1935). According to S. Srikantha Sastri[120] the date of *Mudrārākṣasa* is between 388 and 415 A. D., but Jarl Charpentier[121] places it in the late 5th century A. D.

According to V. V. Mirashi[122], the birth-place of Bhavabhūti was Padampur, near Āmgaon in the Bhaṇḍārā district of C. P. Bhavabhūti has been identified with Umbeka, also called Sureśvara and Viśvarūpa, by S. K. Ramanatha Sastriar[123]. Amongst his dramas, the critical edition of the *Mahāvīracarita* by Todar Mall[124], and the study of its text by S. K. De[125] deserve special mention.

S. K. De has also contribbuted an exhaustive study to the problem of *Mahānāṭaka*[126], with the specimen text of a new recension.

In 1925, Anujan Achan edited Bodhāyana's *Bhagavadajjukīyam.*[127]

It is difficult to enumerate all the studies and articles which have appeared in the domain of Alaṁkāra-Śāstra. The foremost among them are:—

(1) Hari Chand Shastri: *Kālidāsa et l'art Poetique de l'inde* (Alaṁkāra—Śāstra), Paris, 1917.

(2) S. K. De: *Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 2 volumes, London, 1923, 1925.

---

119. R. Ramamurti in the August issue of JOR, Madras, 1938, mentions a play *Abhisārikāvañcitaka* or ° *bandhitaka* by Viśākhadeva, who is different from Viśākhadatta. For further studies on the *Mudrārākṣasa* and its author see Jogendrachandra Ghosh: *Was Viśākhadatta a Bengali?* JASB, XXVI, 1930, No. 1; Daśaratha Śarmā: *The Ancestry and Caste of Candragupta Maurya according to Mudrārākṣasa*, Poona Orientalist, V, July-Oct. 1940; H. C. Seth: *Identification of Parvataka and Porus*, IHQ, 1941, 160 ff.; R. Sathianathiar: *Historical Notes on the Mudrārākṣasa*, JOR, Madras, XII, pt. ii, April-June, 1938.

120. IHQ, 1931, 163 ff.

121. IHQ, 1931, 629.

122. IHQ, 1935, 287 ff.

123. J And. H. R. S., Jan. 1927.

124. New York, 1928.

125. IA, 1930, 13-18; See also K. P. Jayaswal, JBORS, XIX, 11.

126. IHQ, 1931, 537-642; See also, S. K. De: *A Reference to the Mahānāṭaka* Jha Comm. Vol., 1937, 139-144; S. P. Bhattacharya: *The Mahānāṭaka Problem*, IHQ, 1934, 493-508.

127. On this *prahasana*, see Asokanatha Bhattacharya: *Bhagavadajjukīyam and some new problems*, Or. Conf., 1926; Anujan Achan: *The Bhagavadajjukīyam*, IHQ, 1927, 171 ff.

(3) P. V. Kane: *The History of Alaṁkāra Literature*, in the introduction to his second edition of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, I, II and X, Bombay, 1923.

(4) S. K. De: *The Outlines of Rasa Theory*, Sir Asutosh Silver Jubilee Vol. III, Orientalia, 1922, pp. 207–253.

(5) V. V. Sovani: *Pre-dhvani Schools of Alaṁkāra*, Bhand. Comm. Vol. I p. 263 ff.

(6) Batukanatha Bhattacharya: *A Brief Survey of Sāhitya-śāstra*, J. Dept. of Letters, Cal. Univ., 1923, 97 ff.

(7) J. Nobel: *Foundations of Indian Poetry*, Calcutta, 1925.

(8) A. Sankaran: *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism*, Madras, 1929.

(9) V. Raghavan: *The Vṛttis*, JOR, Madras, VII, pt. 1, Jan–March, 1933. The paper shows the position of *Vṛttis* in relation to *Rasas* and types of dramas and heroes.

(10) S. P. Bhattacharya: *Rasābhāsa in Alaṁkāra Literature*, Cal. O. J., II, No. 10 (July, 1935).

(11) S. K. De: *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetic*, Dacca University Studies, 1936, Vol II, pp. 1–46.

(12) T. N. Sreekantaiyya: *Imagination in Indian Poetics*, IHQ, 1937, 59ff.

(13) P. C. Lahiri: *Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics*, Dacca Univ. Bulletin, 1937.

(14) V. Raghavan: *History of Bhāvika in Sanskrit Poetics*, IHQ, 1938, 787ff.

(15) A. Sankaran: *Poetry and Rasa*, JOR, Madras, XII, Jan.–March 1938.

(16) P. Subbarama Pattar: *Studies in Dhvanyāloka*, Trichur, 1938.

(17) V. Raghavan: *Number of Rasas*, Madras, 1940.

(18) Har Dutt Sharma: *Hāsya as a Rasa in Sanskrit Rhetorics and Literature*, Annals, XXII, pts. i–ii, 1941, 103–115.

Amongst the texts of *Alaṁkāra*, the following are noteworthy :—

(1) *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Bhāmaha.[128] ; S. K. De has contributed an

128. Edited with Eng. Trans. by P. V. Naganatha Sastry, Tanjore, 1927; and the text with introduction by Batuka Nātha Śarmā and Baladeva Upādhyāya in Kashi Sanskrit Series, 1928; also by D. T. Tatacharya, Trivadi, Tanjore, with a *Vṛtti*.

article on Bhāmaha's view on Guṇa.[129] On the several questions relating to Bhāmaha, articles have been contributed by K. B. Pathak,[130] P. V. Kane,[131] H. R. Divekar[132] and Giuseppe Tucci.[133]

(2) *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin:[134] S. K. De discusses the relative priority of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin,[135] and the relation between Bhāravi and Daṇḍin.[136]

(3) *Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha* of Udbhaṭa.[137]

(4) *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra* of Vāmana.[138] Malati Sen[139] holds that this Vāmana is different from the author of Kāśikā.

(5) *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Rudraṭa.[140]

(6) *Dhvanyāloka* with *Locana*.[141]

(7) *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rājaśekhara.[142]

129. Pathak Comm. Vol., 353-358, Poona, 1934.

130. JBRAS, XXIII, 18. The writer discusses the question whether the *Nyāsakāra* mentioned by Bhāmaha is Jinendrabuddhi or different.

131. *Bhāmaha, Bhāsa and Māgha*, JBRAS, XXIII, 91.

132. *Bhāmaha, Bhaṭṭi and Daṇḍin*, JRAS, Oct. 1929. The writer collects evidences in support of the contention that Bhāmaha could not have written his work after Bhaṭṭi and Dharmakīrti.

133. *Bhāmaha and Diṅnāga*, IA, June, 1930. The writer is of opinion that Bhāmaha's logical theories in *Kāvyālaṁkāra* allude to Diṅnāga and not to Dharmakīrti who was posterior to Bhāmaha.

134. Ed. by S. K. Belvalkar and R. B. Raddi in the Bombay Sansk. Series. Sanskrit Text with Tibetan version, ed. by Anukul Chandra Banerjee, Calcutta Univ., 1939.

135. See his note on *Avantīsundarīkathā*, IHQ, III, 395.

136. IHQ, I, 31-36.

137. Ed. by N. D. Banahatti, in Bombay S. S. (79), Poona, 1925; also in the GOS, Baroda, 1931.

138. Ed. by N. N. Kulkarni, Poona Or. Series, No. 34; its translation in Eng. by Jha appeared in the same Series, No. 35. The text has also been partly edited in the issues of Cal. Or. J. (1935) by Malati Sen.

139. *The Kāśikā and the Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti*, Cal. Or. J., I, vi & vii (March 1934 and April 1934). For other studies on Vāmana, see V. V. Sovani's article in the Bhandarkar Comm. Vol., p. 398 ff. and P. V. Kane, IA, XLI, 204.

140. Re-edited in Kāvyamālā Series, Bombay, 1928.

141. Only the first Fasc. with his own comm. *Upalocana* was edited by S. Kuppuswami Sastri, Madras, 1932. S. K. De edited the *Locana* on the iv ch. in Journ. Dept. of Letters, Calcutta, 1922. A new edition with the *Bālapriyā* of Rāma Śāraka is brought out by Pattabhiram Sastri, Benares, 1940.

142. Second edition, GOS, Baroda, 1924. Recently a new edition with the commentaries of Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste and Madhusūdana Miśra has appeared from Benares.

(8) Fragments of Bhaṭṭanāyaka.[143]

(9) *Vakroktijīvita* of Kuntaka.[144]

(10) *Vyaktiviveka* of Mahimabhaṭṭa.[145]

(11) *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*[146] and a few chapters of the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*[147] of Bhoja.

(12) *Kāvyaprakāśa* of Mammaṭa.[148]

(13) *Alaṁkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka, with the commentary of Samudrabandha.[149]

(14) *Kāvyānuśāsana* of Hemacandra.[150]

(15) *Candrāloka* of Jayadeva.[151]

(16) *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha.[152]

143. Ed. by T. R. Chintamani in JOR, Madras (1927), 257.

144. Second edition by S. K. De, Cal. 1928; See also Har Dutt Sharma: *Kuntaka's Conception of Guṇas*, IHQ, 1932, 257 ff.; K. A. Sankaran: *Kuntaka's attitude towards Dhvani*, JOR, Madras, 1927, 45 ff.

145. Ed. with Ruyyaka's comm. and his own comm. *Madhusūdanī* by Madhusūdana Miśra, Kashi Sans. Series, No. 121, 1936; See also V. V. Sovani's article in the Bhand. Comm. Vol., p. 392.

146. Ed. in Kāvyamālā Series, No. 95, in 1925; second ed. in 1934.

147. Ed. by H. H. the Yadugiri Svāmin of Melkote. An excellent study in English is being serially published in the New Indian Antiquary (March 1939, onwards) Bombay, by V. Raghavan of Madras. The whole work, the first vol. of which is out, covers about 1000 pages, and was the author's thesis for the Ph. D. of the Madras University.

148. Fourth edition of Jhalkikar, Poona, 1921; with *Saṅketa* in the Ānandāśrama S. Series, 1921; with *Dīpikā* of Caṇḍīdāsa on I-III ed. by S. P. Bhattacharya, Benares, 1933; with *Nāgeśvarī* ed. by Hariśaṁkaraśarmā in Chowk. S. S., Benares, 1933; with *Sudhāsāgara* of Bhīmasena, Chowk. S. S., Benares; English Translation by Ganga Nath Jha, Allahabad, 1925; with his comm., *Kāvyaprakāśavistāriṇī* and Eng. Transl. on I-III by Har Dutt Sharma, Poona, 1935 and 1939; the X ch. of Chandorkar's edn. revised by Har Dutt Sharma, Poona, 1935; Eng. Trans. of I and II by H. D. Velankar, P. P. Joshi and S. S. Sukthankar, Bombay and Kolhapur; with Maheśvara's comm. edited from Calcutta; with *Lauhitya* of Gopālabhaṭṭa, Trivand. S. S.; with *Bṛhaṭṭīkā* of Śrīvidyācakravartin, Trivand. S. S.; with *Ṛjuvṛtti* of Narasiṁha, Calcutta; with *Kāvyaprakāśasaṅketa* of Rucaka, ed. by S. P. Bhattacharya, Cal. Or. Journal, II, 7-8 (April-May, 1935). See also H. R. Divekar: *The Dual authorship of Kāvyaprakāśa*, JRAS, July, 1927.

149. Trivand. S. S., XL, 1926.

150. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by Rasiklal C. Parikh and R. B. Athavale in two vols., Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay, 1938; On the treatment of Prakrit by Hemacandra, see C. D. Dalal's Introduction to *Bhavisattakathā*, GOS, Baroda, pp. 63-65.

151. Ed. by Anant Ram Shastri, Benares, 1938.

152. Ed. by Karuṇākara with 2 commentaries, Lahore, 1938.

(17) *Alaṁkārakaustubha* of Kavikarṇapūra.[153]

(18) *Alaṁkāraśekhara* of Keśavamiśra.[154]

(19) *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra* of Prakāśavarṣa.[155]

(20) *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* by Nṛsiṁha Kavi, alias Abhinava-kālidāsa, eulogising Nañjarāja, son of Vīrabhūpa of Mysore.[156]

(21) *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti* of Amaracandra.[157]

(22) *Rasārṇavasudhākara* of Śiṅgabhūpāla.[158]

(23) *Bhāvaprakāśana* of Śāradātanaya.[159]

(24) *Kāvyaḍākinī* of Gaṅgānanda, patronised by king Karṇa of Bikaner.[160]

(25) *Rasapradīpa* of Prabhākara, son of Mādhavabhaṭṭa, and grandson of Rāmeśvara, composed in 1583 A. D.[161]

(26) *Alaṁkāramañjūṣā* of Bhaṭṭa Devaśaṁkara.[162]

In the field of Sanskrit Anthology, only two major works have appeared—*Saduktikarṇāmṛta*[163] of Śrīdharadāsa, and *Sūktimuktāvalī*[164] of Jalhaṇa. The *Kavīndracandrodaya*[165] contains a collection of verses in praise of Kavīndrācārya Sarasvati of Benares. Amongst the articles bearing on the Anthologies, mention may be made of :—

(1) S. K. De : *Vallabadeva, author of Subhāṣitāvalī.*[166]

(2) D. C. Bhattacarya : *Date of Subhāṣitāvalī.*[167]

---

153. Ed. by S. P. Bhattacharya, Rajashahi, I Part in 1926, II Part in 1934.

154.. Kashi Sanskrit Series, Banares, 1927.

155. Ed. with an Introduction by V. Venkatarama Sharma, IHQ, March, 1929, i—xxii, 1-20.

156. Ed. by E. Krishnamacharya, GOS, Baroda, 1931.

157. Ed. by Jagannath Shastri Hoshing, Kashi S. S., Benares, 1931.

158. Trivand. S. S., No. 50.

159. Ed. by H. H. Yadugiri Svāmin and K. S. Ramaswami, GOS, Baroda, 1930.

160. Ed. by Jagannath Shastri, Sarasvatī-Bhav. Text Series, Benares, 1924.

161. Ed. by Nārāyaṇa Sāstri Khiste, Saras. Bh. Text. Series.

162. Ed. by S. L. Katre, Ujjain, 1940.

163. Text edited by the Rāmāvatāra Śarma, with an Introduction by Har Dutt Sharma, Lahore, 1933. (Punjab Oriental Series).

164. Ed. by E. Krishnamacharya, GOS, Baroda, 1938.

165. Ed. by Har Dutt Sharma and M. M. Patkar, Poona Or. Series, 1939.

166. JRAS, 1927.

167. JRAS, 1928, Jan.

(3) Rāmāvatāra Śarmā: *A Note on Sanskritic and Sanskrit Anthologies*[168].

(4) H. D. Velankar: *Prince Sambhāji as a poet*[169]. Here a work called *Budhabhūṣaṇa* ascribed to Sambhāji, the son of Śivāji is described.

(5) Har Dutt Sharma: *Sūktisundara of Sundaradeva*[170].

(6) Har Dutt Sharma: *The Subhāṣitahārāvali of Śrī Hari Kavi and some poets enjoying the patronage of Muslim Rulers*[171].

(7) P. K. Gode: *Hari Kavi alias Bhānubhaṭṭa, a Court-poet of King Sambhāji and his works*[172].

(8) Har Dutt Sharma: *The Poet Bhānukara*[173]. He is identified with Bhānudatta, the author of Rasamañjarī. He lived in the courts of Vīrabhānu and Nizam Khan (=Sikandar Lodi) in the beginning of the 16th century A. D.

(9) P. K. Gode: *Some data for the identification of Vīrabhānu, the patron of the poet Bhānukara*[174]. Here it is proved that Bhānu was the name of the grandfather of Māna Singh (1556–1605).

(10) P. K. Gode: *The Terminus of Bhānudatta's date, 1572 A.D.*[175]

(11) Har Dutt Sharma: *An analysis of the authorities quoted in the Śārṅgadharapaddhati*[176].

I shall conclude this article with the mention of Messrs P. K. Gode[177] and V. Raghavan[178], who have done immense service to the

---

168. J. Bih. O. R. S., XV, pts i & ii.
169. JBB RAS, New Series, I, No. 2.
170. Cal. Or. Journal, III (1936), 133.
171. IHQ, 1934, 478–486.
172. Annals, XVII, pt. i, Oct. 1935.
173. Ibid, pt. iii, April 1936.
174. Cal. Or. J., II, 6 (March, 1935); it is contd. in July 1935 issue of the same Journal.
175. Annals, XVI, pts. i–ii, Oct.–Jan. 1934–35.
176. Annals, XVIII, pt. i, Oct. 1936.
177. Among a legion of chronological notes, I mention only a very few:—
    (1) *Date of Kedārabhaṭṭa's Vṛttaratnākara*, before 1297 A. D.
    (2) *Jinasamudrasūri, a commentator on Kumārasambhava*, Annals, XVI, pts. i & ii, Oct–Jan. 1934–1935.
    (3) *A comm. on Naiṣadhīyacarita by Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa, its probable date bet. 1491 and 1730, or the first half of the 16th cent. A. D.*, Cal. Or. J., II, Sept. 1935.

cause of Indian chronology. For want of space I have been able to note only a few of their articles and works.

---

(4) *A comm. on Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra by Rājahaṁsopādhyāya about the 2nd half of the 14th cent. A. D.*, Ibid.

(5) *The Date of Padyāmṛtataraṅgiṇī of Bhāskara*, 12th June 1673. Cal. Or. J., II, Nov. 1935.

(6) *Rasakaumudī* about the latter half of the 18th cent. A. D., Ibid.

(7) *Śaṁkaravilāsacampū*, composed under the orders of Nānā Sahib Peshwa, 1757 A. C.—Poona Orientalist, I, 4, 1937.

(8) *Date of Nāṭakalakṣaṇakośa*, before 1431 A.:D., Annals, XIX, pt. iii., April 1938.

(9) *History of Svabhāvokti*, Ind. Culture, V (Oct. 1938).

(10) *Guṇapatākā*, IHQ, 1941, 82 ff.

(11) *Date of Rākṣasakāvya, before A. D. 1000.* J. Ind. His., XIX, pt. 3, Dec. 1940.

(12) *Dates of Udayarāja and Jagaddhara*, J. Univ. Bomb., IX, pt. 2, Sep. 1940.

178. (i) *Alaṁkāracandrikā* of king Nārāyaṇa, (ii) *Camatkāracandrikā* of Viśveśvara, (iii) *Rasamīmāṁsā* of Kāśīśvaramiśra, (iv) *Rasamīmāṁsā* of Vidyācakravartin, (v) Names of Abhinanda, the author of the *Rāmacarita* and its extent.—Annals, XVI, pts. i and ii, Oct.-Jan. 1934-1935. (vi) *Anekasandhāna-kāvyas*, Annals, III, pt. iii, 1938-1939. (vii) *The Bhallaṭaśataka* of Bhallaṭa of the 9th century A. D., Annals of Śrī Venk. O. Institute, Tirupati, I, i, March 1940.

PRE-VEDIC TIMES TO VIJAYANAGARA : A SURVEY OF 25 YEARS' WORK IN ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

By

H. D. Sankalia

This year the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute celebrates its Silver Jubilee. These 25 years have been a period of both political and cultural advance in India. More universities and educational institutions, some specializing in research, have sprung up. The number of Indian scholars, books and journals has consequently greatly increased. It has been therefore thought necessary to prepare from time to time articles surveying or listing the work done in a particular subject or subjects. Actuated by this desire, even before 1917, Lüders[1] and Kielhorn[2] published lists of early Indian inscriptions. Sewell[3] gave a digest of the historical inscriptions of Southern India. Recently D. R. Bhandarkar[4] has listed the North Indian inscriptions from about 200 A. D.

Heras writing on the Aravidu dynasty of Vijayanagara contributed an exhaustive classified bibliography on the subject. Two years later (1928) appeared the *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, covering the entire work done during the year 1926 in India and adjacent countries, whereas a similar bibliography pertaining to Indian history for the year 1927 was published in the *Journal of the Bombay Historical Society*. Since then we have 'The Bibliography of Prehistoric Indian Antiquities' by the late Prof. H. C. Dasgupta,[5] of 'Ancient Indian Terracotta Figurines' by C. C. Dasgupta,[6] and of 'Indian Numismatics ; by C. R. Singhal.[7] It is now a practice with writers on Indian history to append a list of inscriptions and such other bibliographical literature which they have used.

1 'A List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest times to about A. D. 400.' *Ep. Ind.*, X, *Appendix*, pp. 1-226.

2 'A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India from about A. D. 400.' *Ep. Ind.*, V, *Appendix*, pp. 1-96.

3 *The Historical Inscriptions of Southern India, Madras, 1932.*

4 'A List of Inscriptions of Northern India written in Brāhmī and its derivative scripts.' *Ep. Ind.*, XIX—XXIII.

5 *JASB.*, N. S. XXVII, 1931, No. 1.

6 *JRASB.*, IV, 1938, No. 2.

7 *Ibid.*

Recently the India Society sponsored a scheme to review the work done by the Archaeological. Survey of India. Several past and present members of the staff collaborated, revealing India's past glory.[1] Before this already individual scholars[2] had written articles reviewing the archaeological work done in the country either in a particular year or during a specific period.[3]

The present survey is an attempt in the same direction. If it seeks to cover a much wider field, it is because the ground-work was already prepared by the Kern Institute for a period of over 12 years (1926-1937). To its labours the writer is indebted.[4] Unfortunately the war has stopped this excellent work. However, wherever possible the bibliography has been brought up to date with the facilities available in Poona. But it is possible that in this single-handed effort some important omissions might have occurred.[5]

In a survey of this kind the writer would follow a geogrophico-chronological order, although there is some difficulty in doing so. For, excepting a few books and reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, a majority of the works on the subject were not written from the regional point of view, but from the strictly chronological or dynastic point of view. However, with a view to knowing the progress made in any particular region of India and suggesting the possible means of accelerating it the writer has tried to review the progress of studies in prehistory, protohistory and ancient Indian history from a regional point of view.

In the quarter under review Indian prehistory and proto-history received a sudden fillip by the chance discovery and subsequent systematic excavation of the mounds at Mohenjodaro. Prior to 1918 work in Indian prehistory was sporadic and undertaken by persons who were interested but not trained in the subject. To the labours of these people however we owe our knowledge of the megalithic

---

1 *Revealing India's Past.*

2 Sastri, *Dr. S. K. Iyengar Volume*, p. 143, Lüders, *ZDMG.*, VIII, pp. 1—20.

3 While sending the article to the press the writer learns that the Director General of Archaeology has published a Summary of the Department's work during the last 25 years. The publication is for private use only.

4 The writer would thank here Messers A. H. Dharmadikari and M. M. Patkar, B. A., for compiling a card index for him.

5 More so because after the writer accepted the invitation of the Secretary to write a survey article, he had to be away on field work for a long time. This and the subsequent disruption of library facilities has prevented him from treating the subject more exhaustively, as he originally wanted to.

monuments and their contents in South India, whereas to Bruce Foote we owe our knowledge of purely prehistoric finds not only from South India but from other parts of India as well. Mitra tried to present whatever was known upto 1923 in a connected form in his *Prehistoric India*[1]. Indian prehistory however remained in a very unsatisfactory condition for it was not based on a systematic and scientific study of the subject. Mohenjodaro gave it a certain impetus. For the culture that it revealed could not be correlated satisfactorily either with the Vedic or the later historic cultures of India. Certain affinities between its and the Mesopotamian finds as well as the nature of its own finds permits the inference, which is generally accepted, that the Mohenjodaro or the Harappa culture belongs to the Copper or Chalcolithic Age which flourished in the Indus Valley about 2500 B. C.

Want of correlation of the Indus culture with the known Indian cultures has necessitated the systematic unravelling of its antecedants and consequents, namely, the Stone Ages which preceded it and the Iron Age, which followed it. The work of De Terra and Paterson and their colleagues[2] in Kashmir and the adjacent Sohan, Indus and Hero valleys of the Punjab has, for the first time put Indian prehistory on a solid foundation. They have discovered human artifacts in definitely assignable geological strata, whereas till now most of the discoveries were of surface finds. Kashmir however is but a part of India. Scores of other river-valleys remain to be similarly explored. Fortunately the lead given by De Terra's expedition was taken up by the Archaeological Survey and other bodies in India. The former along with the Deccan College Research Institute undertook the survey of the Sabarmati and other valleys in Gujarat, whence Bruce Foote had reported a few surface finds in 1893. Its work when complete will also enable us to write a chapter in Indian prehistory.

After a lapse of about 50 yars South Indian prehistoric studies have been revived by the efforts of Cammiade[3], Richards, Krishna-

---

1. 1st edition; 2nd edition, Calcutta, 1927.

2. *Studies on the Ice Age in India and Associated Human cultures*, Washington, 1939; see also De Terra, "The Siwaliks of India and Early Man in *Early Man* (Ed. G. G. MacCirdy, and Paterson, "Geology and Early Man," *Nature*, July 6, 1940. p. 12 and 13, (p. 49. 1937, p. 257 ff.)

3. *Antiquity*, IV, 1930, p. 326

swami and others. Krishnaswami[1] has taken up a systematic survey of the Palar and other rivers of Madras.

Reports have also been published of similar work in the village of Kuliana, Mayurbhanj State, Bengal.[2]

Apart from this regular river-valley survey for the traces of Early Man in different parts of India. human artifacts have also been found otherwise. Munn discovered some along with fossil remains in the Godavari valley in the Hyderabad State and some neoliths from Jamalpur,[3] whereas Todd[4] reports palaeolithic industries from the Kandivli, Borivli and other suburbs of Bombay.

Dolmens. ·and other megalithic monuments have continued to receive attention as before but now they are studied more scientifically. Their further discovery is reported from Malbar[5], Pulney Hills (Kodaikanal), Madras proper and S. India[6] Hyderabad[7] and as far north as Poona[8] in the Deccan, as well as from the high lands of Central India[9] Assam[10], and Kashmir.[11] Unfortunetly these monuments cannot be satisfactorily dated.[12] But it might be possible to do so when their contents are properly excavated and examined as they now seem to be[13].

Equally untrustworthy as to age are the rock-paintings and engravings more of which have been found recently from the

---

1. *Prehistoric Man Round Madras*, Indian Academy of Science, Madras, 1938; and "Environmental and Cultural Changes of Prehistoric Man near Madras," *J. Mad. Geogra., Association.*, Vol, XIII, pp. 58-90.

2. *Man in India*, Vol. XXI. 1941, p. 226.

3. *AB.*, III, No. 132.

4. *Journal Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. LXIX, 1939, pp. 257-72. It is a pity that these promising sites should have been spoiled by too much quarrying and subsequent filling, as the writer found them to be when he visited them after the publication of Todd's article.

5. *AB.*, IV, No. 130; I, No. 119.

6. *Ibid*, III, No. 83; also Numa Laffite, *Rapport...L'Inde*, Paris, 1932 and *ASI. AR.*, 1930-34, p. 112; 1934-35, pp. 45, 43; 1936-37, p. 67.

7. *Hyderabad Arch. Dept Report. AB.*, VII, No. 129.

8. *Bulletin, DCRI.*, I, pp. 178-184.

9. *JBORS.*, I, p. 229; II, p. 485; VI, p. 393; *Census of India*, I, pt. iii, 1935, and Guha, 'Progress of Science in India', in the India Science Congress 25 years Survey Volume, 1938, p. 311; also *ASI., AR.*, 1930-34, p. 141.

10. *J. Roy. Anthropo. Institute*, 52 (1922); also 20 (1921). and 56 (1926).

11. De Terra and Peterson, *The Ice Age* etc., pp. 233-34, pl. XXIV.

12. For a general survey see Ghurye, *Man in India*, 1926, and Guha, *op. cit.*

13. *AB.*, VII, Nos. 99, 106, 107, 110, 111-12, 129, 149.

Central Provinces[1] and Sind[2]. Their date may be anywhere from the early centuries of the Christian era to 1000 B. C. or more. Unless found with datable associated remains Indian rock-paintings as well as megaliths will not yield the desired links with the Indus culture or with that of the Stone Ages. We may however expect such links from the Mysore Archaeological Department's excavations, if they are carried on on an extensive scale, at Chandravalli[3] and Brahmageri[4] or from Hyderabad Archaeological Department's work at Kondapur[5] etc. What is required is an organised and co-ordinated scheme of exploration in every part of India, particularly in Gujarat, Kathiawar, Rajputana and the United Provinces.

If any archaeological discovery in India has had so much wide publicity it is the discovery of Mohenjodaro. General reports about it have not only appeared several times in English in India and elsewhere, but articles on it have also appeared in many of the Indian languages—Gujarati, Marathi, Bengali, Hindi, besides Japanese, German, French and Italian. In spite of such world-wide fame, the culture displayed by the Indus Valley has not been fully understood. For its script has not yet been deciphered to the satisfaction of all scholars. Consequently the creators of the culture have remained an enigma. Some scholars therefore attempted to unravel its mystery by studying the material objects, and correlating them with those in India or outside it; some have tried to compare it with the Vedic or Aryan, or the Dravidian culture, whereas others are busy interpreting the script itself.

The Indus script has been thought to be related to the Brāhmī or to the Easter Islands or to the Hittite, Etruscan or supposed to be proto-Dravidian by Langdon,[6] Waddell[7] and Pran Nath[8] and Hevesy,[9] Horzney,[10] Piccoli,[11] and Heras[12] respectively. It is

---

1. *Ibid.*, X, No. 203,; VII, No. 103.
2. *JRASB.*, VII, 1941, No. 2, pp. 197—202, Pls. 4—12.
3. Presidential Address, Sec. of Anthropology, 29th Science Congress, Baroda, 1942. p, 16.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 18 ff.
5. *ABORI.*, XXII, pp. 171—184.
6. Marshall, *MJD.*, and *AB.*, IX, No. 238.
7. *AB.*, I, No. 222.
8. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 232 a.
9. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 228—29 and IX, No. 237; cf. also *ABORI.*, XIX, p. 122 and XX, p. 262,
10. *IHQ.*, XVI, pp. 683—88.
11. *AB.*, IX, No. 241.
12. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 232 and XI, No. 284.

exhaustively and objectively examined and classified by Hunter[1] and to some extent by Sarton,[2] Ross[3] and others. Which of these interpretations is correct will be decided only by a bilingual inscription. Granting Heras' hypothesis, his seems to be the most methodical approach to the subject which is also supported by the correlation of the Cretan, Mesopotamian and Indus finds.

Ignorance of the Indus language has caused wide divergence of opinion as to the charcater of its culture and its place in Indian culture. Its discoverers—Marshall and others—thought it to be non-Aryan, having no relation with the Vedic civilization. This view was supported by Keith[4] and others. Sarup[5] and a few others think it to be Ṛgvedic; Chanda[6] a mixture: non-Aryan and Aryan; while Heras,[7] from his interpretation of the seals, proto-Dravidian; and Pran Nath[8] Sumero-Egyptian.

A purely objective study of some items of its material culture has led scholars to trace their affinity with Mesopotamian,[9] Egyptian,[10] Cretan and other Mediterranian Cultures, while their survivals have also been noticed in punch-marked coins, terracottas, images etc. by Pran Nath[11], Gordon,[12] Das Gupta,[13] Heras[14] and Arvamuthan.[15]

Many problems of international importance have been raised by Indus finds. Solutions of many of these will depend upon when and how clues of the spread of this and cognate cultures found by Vats in Kathiawar[16] and Majumdar in Sind,[17] Hargreaves in

1. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 238.
2. *Ibid.*, V, No. 255.
3. *NIA.*, II, pp. 554—58.
4. *AB.*, IX, No. 390.
5. *Indian Culture*, IV, pp. 149—169.
6. *AB.*, IV, No. 329.
7. *Ibid.*, also Ayyar, *Ibid.*, IV, Nos. 83-84.
8. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 256, XII, No. 237.
9. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 118; IV, No. 92; IX, No. 541 a.
10. *Ibid.*, X, No. 536.
11. *AB.*, VI, No. 232.
12. *Iraq.*, and *JRASB*, VI, 1940, pp. 61-104.
13. *Ibid.*, No. 234. (*Man*, XXXV, No. 104)
14. *IHQ.*, XIV, pp. 245—55. etc.
15. *NIA.*, IV, pp. 253-70, 294-313, 319-336.
16. *AB.*, X, pp. 1—2.
17. *Ibid.*,

Baluchistan,[1] Stein in different parts of Baluchistan[2] and Iran[3] and by a number of foreign expeditions in Iran,[4] Syria,[5] Palestine[6] and Mesopotamia[7] are followed up. In India itself planned explorations are necessary in Gujarat, Kathiawar, Rajputana and the Punjab. For a proper knowledge of Early Man in India, important river valleys both in the north and the south should be systematically surveyed. Then only his migrations can be correlated with the existing evidence from Kashmir, Gujarat, Bengal and Madras and from the Far East where too his traces have been found in Burma,[8] the Malay[9] Archipelago, Indo-China,[10] Siam[11] and Formosa.[12]

The discovery of the Indus Culture has also led to the reconsideration of the question of Aryan invasion of India. Was it in about 1500 B. C., as generally believed on the strength of Boghazkuei inscriptions and the internal evidence supplied by the Vedic literature itself, or before or contemperary with the Indus Age or did it never take place ? Patil[13] sought to prove that the invasion idea was a myth which was immediately contradicted by Thomas[14] and Vaidya[15]. Further evidence in favour of the Indo-European origin and immigration into Eastern India is adduced by Keith,[16] Jackel[17], Bhandarkar[18] and others.

---

1. *Ibid.*, IV, No. 121.
2. *Ibid.*, IV, Nos. 145-46.
3. *Ibid.*, IX, Nos. 769-74.
4. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 768.
5. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 763.
6.
7. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 626, etc.
8. *AB.*, VI, Nos. 526, 566 ; VII, No. 584 ; XII, No. 507.
9. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 545 ; IX, No. 582 ; IX, Nos. 641-42 ; V, No. 629 ; IX, Nos. 669 and 686.
10. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 493.
11. *Ibid.*, VI, Nos. 547, 548 ; VIII, No. 533, IX, No. 613.
12. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 551.
13. *AB.*, III, No. 404 and V, No. 424 ; see also *ABORI.*, XX, p. 49.
14. *Ibid.*, IV, No. 406.
15. *Ibid.*, No. 407.
16. *IHQ.*, XIII, pp. 1-30 ; XIV, pp. 201-223 ; XVI, pp. 423-461 ; *AB.*, IX No. 356.
17. *Ibid.*, No. VI, 317 ; III, No. 431 ; VI. No. 336.
18. *AB.*, II, No. 353.

While the question of Aryan invasion is still unsettled, the view is propounded that either the Dravidians or proto-Dravidians migrated to Sumer[1] or vice versa,[2] or at least there was an ethnic relationship[3] between the ancient inhabitants of Summer, Elam and India.

India of the Vedic and post-Vedic period up to the time of the Mauryas, when the so-called historical period begins, has not yet been fully worked out, primarily owing to the unreliability of the Buddhist, Jain or Brahmanic tradition in general. When Smith wrote his EARLY HISTORY OF INDIA and later when it was reedited in 1924, Rapson and others had published the *Cambridge Ancient Indian History* using Vedic and non-vedic sources and Fick and Rhys David had written on certain aspects of the Buddhist and pre-Buddhist (?) India from the Buddhist sources. But hardly any attempt was made to prepare an outline of political history from the Vedic times to the Maurya period by collating the Vedic, Pauranic, Buddhist and Jain sources, or to work out exhaustively each of these sources separately. Raychaudhuri attempted the former task in his *Political History of Ancient India* in 1923 and since then he has kept this work up to date by incorporating subsequent research on the subject. Pradhan has approached the subject in his *Chronology of Ancient India* from Brahmanic sources alone. Law similarly selected certain aspects-*Kṣatriya Tribes*, *Geography of Buddhism*-of Indian History and worked them out completely from the Buddhist sources. Recently Mehta has published an exhaustive study of the Jātaka literature alone,[4] unfolding the cultural history (not necessarily of the pre-Buddhist or Buddhist India as Mr. Mehta would make us believe but) of a number of centuries from or before the times of Buddha up to the time when the Jātakas were finally codified. The jain literature-āgamic or later-has not yet been systematically tackled. Such a study might not be of value from the point of view of political history but its value to the understanding and interpretation of Indian culture as a whole will be tremendous.

Besides these monographs on the pre-Maurya history individual articles have been comparatively few. These mostly deal with

---

1 *Ibid*,. IV., No. 84.

2 *Ibid*,, IX. No. 773.

3 *AB.*, II, No. 123; VI, No. 393; VII, No. 460; VIII, No. 336; IX, No. 773.

4 *Pre-Buddhist India*, 1941.

kings Udayana of Kosambi [1], Pradyota of Ujjain [2], and Prasenajit of Kosala [3], or the general political history of the period [4].

Maurya history was fairly well-known when Smith and others wrote on the evidence of inscriptions, coins, accconts of foreign writers, Purāṇas etc. Subsequent research has been in the direction of

(1) elucidating the Mauryan chronology, particularly that relating to Candragupta, and his grandson Aśoka :

(2) re-evaluating the expansion of the Maurya empire under Candragupta and Aśoka in the light of new facts ;

(3) deciding the Dharma of Aśoka ;

(4) search for Mauryan monuments :

(5) a critical study of Kauṭalya's *Arthaśāstra*

Views citing further evidence or reinterpreting the old evidence have been expressed placing Candragupta's accession in 313 B. C. or 323-24 B. C. [5] So also about his caste [6]. One scholar [7] explains Vṛṣala as a Greek title Basileus and not anything meaning contemptuous as hitherto believed. This scholar, Seth, further argues that Candra of the Meherauli Pillar is identical with Candragupta Maurya, and that Maurya empire under him included parts of Central Asia, he himself having come from the north-west.[8] These are hypotheses. But indubitable evidence of Bengal forming a part of the Maurya empire and the Jaina tradition of 12 years famine in north India is afforded by the discovery of an inscription from Mahāsthāna. [9]

Studies in Aśoka have been many. Four monographs on the king himself [10] and numerous articles pertaining to his religion etc. have appeared. Of the latter two articles relate to chronology [11] ;

---

1. *AB.*; VII. No. 386 ; IX; Ne. 361 ; XII. No. 314 ; 10th *AICR.*. p. 469.
2. *Ibid.*, V, No. 467: IX, No. 345; VII, No. 372.
3. *Ibid.* VII, No. 351.
4. *Ibid.* V. Nos. 369, 391:
5. *AB.*, VII, Nos. 323, 435; *IHQ.*, XI, p. 211, *IC.*, II. p. 557.
6. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 355, *Aiyangar Vol.*, pp. 93-99.
7. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 385.
8. *NIA*, II, p. 625, *IHQ.*, XIII, p. 400; *AB.*, XII, No. 383.
9. *AB.*, VIII, No. 2. 246-47 ; IX, 259-60 ; *EP.* Ind., XXII, p. 1.
10. *Ibid.*, III, No. 389 ; V, No. 416 ; VIII, No. 344.
11. *Ibid.*, VI, 295 ; IX, 327 ; VII, No. 332 a.

some to his religion [1]; whether Aśoka embraced Buddhism or not (a recent author maintains that Aśoka was a Jain [2]); some to the explanation of certain terms in Asokan edicts and identification of places [3]—such as Satiyaputa and other miscellaneous topics. Important however is the discovery of a number of new Asokan edicts at Maski, Kopabal, Yerragundi [4], confirming the Mauryan sway over the Deccan-Karnataka and even further South. Mention must also be made of the linguistic study of these inscriptions by Bloch, Hultzsch, Woolner, Turner, Bhandarkar and others [5].

Mauryan Archaeology has been enriched by the discovery of wooden palisades of Candragupta at Patna [6]: of Mauryan level at Taxila [7], Kosam [8], Sankisa [9], Chandravalli [10], etc : by the supposed discovery of Mauryan and pre-Mauryan terra-cottas [11] and identification of certain symbols on coins [12] as those of Candragupta, Daśaratha and others.

Much light on the Mauryan administration and polity in general has been thrown by the many sided study of Kauṭalya's *Arthaśāstra* and thd correlation of it with information gathered from Asokan inscriptins. Besides several articles there are a few monographs on these subjects such as Dikshitar's *Mauryan Potity* [13] Ghoshal's *Hindu Revenue System*[14] and Gopala's *Mauryan Finance* [15] and Pran Nath's *Economic Conditions of Ancient India.* [16]

Aurel Stein's explorations between the upper Swat and the Indus have helped considerably in following Alexander's campaign

---

1. *Ibid.*, II, No. 347; III, No. 256; IX, No. 501.
2. Shah, and Vyas, *Nag. Prach. Patr.* XVI, pp. 1-65.
3. *AB.*, IX, No. 499; No. X, 487,; IX, No. 291; *S. K.* Iyan. Com., *Vol*, p. 33.
4. *AB.*, VII, No. 300; VI, No. 285; VIII, No. 251.
5. *AB.*, II, No. 241; VI, No. 246; I, No. 194; IX, No. 312; and recently Mehendale, *Bull. DCRI.*, III, pp. 225-290.
6. *Ibid.*, III, No. 124 ; and *Ind. Cul.*, V, p. 112.
7.
8.
9. *Ibid.*, II, No. 118.
10.
11. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 129 ; IX, No, 224.
12. *Ibid.*, IX, Nos. 431. 531, 533, 538-40, 546,
13. *AB.*, IV, No: 405.
14. *Ibid.*, V. No. 367.
15.
16. *Ibid.*, VII; No. 468.

on the Indian North-west Frontier[1]; whereas the site where Poras contacted him is identified as Jhelum[2] and not Jalalpur as previously thought; the rock fortress of Aornos is discovered[3]. Other scholars have written on Sangala mentioned by Alexander's historians[4]; on Antiochos[5], on Poras[6] and the invasion in general[7]. Connected with this period are works or articles on Megasthenes and Indian Society,[8] Alexander in Indian literature, Iranians and Greeks in India and so forth.[9]

In the Sunga history, the same old topics—caste, dynastic name etc. of the Puṣyamitra family—continue to be discussed[10]. Further historical data on the trade and commercial activities of the period is extracted from Patañjali[11]. Discovery of inscriptions from Ayodhya,[12] Nagari[13] (Chitod), coins [14] and identification of certain sculptures[15] as those of the 'Sunga age add to the existing sources of knowledge. Khāravela, perhaps a contemporary of the Sungas, has not yet emerged from the veil of mystery. His Hathigumpha inscription continually draws the attention of scholars who have since its discovery tried to interpret it by studying its script, its language and the allusions made in it to persons and events[16].

Nothing strikingly new has come forth for the Indo-Greek studies. Mention however must be made of the critical interpretation of the *Yuga Purāṇa* and the entire Indo-Greek sources by Tarn.[17] The whole picture of the episode now stands in clear relief, though at places it seems to have been overdone, particularly the section

---

1. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 496; VIII, 431 etc.
2. Breloer, *Alexanders Kampg gegen Poros*; *AB.*, VIII, No. 325.
3. *AB.*, I, No. 289 (a)
4. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 482.
5. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 319.
6. *IHQ.*, XVII, p. 172.
7. *Ibid.*, XVI, p. 538.
8. *AB.*, IX, Nos. 352 and 472.
9. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 428; XII, No. 339; X, Nos. 318, 399 and *NIA.*, II, p. 639.
10. *AB.*, IV, Nos 330, 333, 355; XII, Nos. 344, 350 and *IHQ.*, XV, pp. 629-32.
11. *Ind.* Cul., II, pp. 362, and 584.
12. *EP. Ind.*, XX, p. 54; *AB.*, II, p. 270.
13. *AB.*, VII, No. 277; *EP. Ind.*, XXII, p. 198.
14. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 537; *Ind. Cul.* V, p. 208.
15. *Ibid.*, II, No. 201; III, No. 137; XII, No. 140.
16. *AB.* II, No. 269; III, Nos. 279-80; V, Nos. 253, 314, 392, 483; VII, 284; IX, 313; X, 518, and *IHO.*, XIV, pp. 459-85.
17. *Greeks in India.*

dealing with the establishment of Greek colonies in India and the section discussing the origin of the Buddha image.

The history of India up to the Maurya period possessed a certain homogeneity and unity, though even then the far South was ruled by three or four kings. This was partly lost during the Śuṅga rule. With its disappearance northern India and other parts of India as well came under the domination of the Śakas, Pāhlavas, and Kushānas whereas the Āndhras ruled at times over a greater part of country south of the Vindhyas. Owing to these facts it becomes convenient to divide the subsequent history of India into (a) Northern and (b) Southern and sketch the progress made in their studies separately.

The Śakas and other foreigners still in a sense have remained foreign to the historians though much work has been done outside India in recent years to throw light on their history before they came into India.

Maues and his successors who were known principally through their coins and a few inscriptions and believed to have supplanted the Indo-Greeks in the north-west are still known in their skeleton form only. Subsequent research has been little and has not added materially to our knowledge. But the study of these people and their monuments before they entered India like Huntingjord's[1] 'Who were the Scythians' dealing with their name, physical characteristics and habits, religion, language and race, and Rene Groussets[2] '*L'Iran Exterieur : son Art* might not only enable us to understand them better but might also help us to understand the art and architecture produced in India at this period.

In India the studies have revolved, round their chronology[3] and origin.[4]

The history of the Kushānas—the successors of Śakas and the Parthians has profited by the discovery of numerous inscriptions in Kharoshṭhi as well as Brāhmī, but the eras mentioned in them still elude a satisfactory solution. Wijk's astronomical study and the adoption of its result by scholars like Sten Konow fail to reconcile a

1. *AB.*, VII, No. 731.
2. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 686.
3. Bhandarkar, *Ind. Cult.*, VII, p. 133 ; Pai, *AB.*, V, No. 344; VIII, No. 303.
4. Konow, *Ibid.*, II, p. 189 ; *AB.*, XII, No. 337 ; *IHQ.* XIV. p. 137.

number of other synchronisms.[1] Consequently the authorship of Saka and Vikrama eras and the chronology of the Kushānas remain disputed. Four main views hold the field. According to the first school of thought Kaniṣka started the era on his accession in 128/129 A. D.[2] Bachhofer, Jayaswal and others[3] think that his accession took place in 78 A. D., whence started the Saka era. The third view attributes the foundation of this era to Vima Kadphises,[4] whereas the fourth attributes it to the Kuntala Sātakarṇi Sātavāhana[5]. In opposition to all these we have the view that Kushānas used the Vikarma era[6] ! !

Equally prolific as the find of inscriptions is the find of coins both of the Early and Late Kushānas. Those of the latter have been found in the Manbhum Dist., showing the existence of the local Scythians in the area as late as the 6th–7th centuries A. D.[7]

The art of the period has drawn the attention of scholars in India[8] and outside,[9] whereas a few new sculptures of the period have been reported from Goa[10] and Kathiawar.[11] Among the general works should be mentioned La Vallée Poussin's *Dynasties et Historie de L'Inde depuis Kaniska* etc.[21] Lévi's ' Kaniṣka et Sātavāhana"[13] and Warmington's and Sarasin's[14] studies of the commerce between India and Rome, and *Burrow's Language of the Kharoshṭhi Documents*[15] and several articles, dealing with topics like St. Thomas and a Kushan King[16] and Economic guilds.[17] A few articles open afresh the question of the relationship between the Western Kṣatrapas and the Kushānas.[18],

Purāṇas found a champion in Pargitar who tried to elucidate from them the political history. They have since been utilised cautiously by Raychaudhuri, Smith and others, while much cre-

1.
2. *AB.*, I, *No.* 238; VIII, No. 303; IV, No. 304.
3. *Ibid.*, IV, No. 299; V, No. 146; XII, No. 312; and *Ind. Cul.* VII, p. 457 and 490.
4. *Ibid.*, III, No. 332.
5. *Ibid.*, X, No. 357.
6. *Ibid.*, X, No. 342.
7. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 423.
8. *Ibid.*, II, No. 168; X, Nos. XI, 161 a, 166; X 208.
9. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 608, 673; XII, No. 180.
10. *Ibid.*, V, No. 180
11. *JRAS.*, 1938, p.
12. *AB.*, XII, No. 394 a.
13. *Ibid*,. XI, No. 427.
14. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 440.
15. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 581.
16. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 389; IX, No. 360.
17. *Ind. Cul.*, VI, pp. 421–28.
18. *AB.*, V, No. 349; XII, No. 396.

dence has been placed in them by Jayaswal and Bose to unveil the hitherto unknown or doubtful points in the post-Maurya political history of India.[1] The former particularly sought to light up the so-called 'Dark Period' by bringing to our notice the Bhāraśivas and the strength or importance of the Vākāṭakas; whereas Bose gives us a reconstruction of the Āndhra chronology.[2] Both these interpretations, remarkable for their originality of outlook, have been regarded as far-fetched and not sobre history.[3] Two other studies attempt at fixing, according to the Puranic contents, synchronisms on certain topics as religious customs and rites in all the Purāṇas,[4] or between the Purāṇas and Gupta inscriptions.[5]

The history of the Guptas, who suddenly appear after the 'Dark Period,' was known in some of its essential outlines mainly based on its own archaeological sources. In the last 25 years, not only fresh archaeological sources—inscriptions, coins and monuments—have been discovered, but a few literary sources have also been discovered which are interpreted to throw light on the origin of the Gupta rule in Magadha, as well as on certain successions within the dynasty. According to Jayaswal and others[6] the drama *Kaumudī Mahotsava* tells us how Candasena (Candragupta I) supplanted the ruling Varman (Maukhāri?) dynasty at Pāṭaliputra and become master of Magadha.

This view is not accepted by all.[7] But there is no doubt that some Maukhāris were a force in the Jamuna valley in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D., as attested by the Yupa inscriptions found by Altekar.[8]

Similarly extracts from the drama *Devi Candraguptam* are supposed to refer to a king Rāmagupta, who preceded Candragupta II[9].

1. *History of India*
2. *JRASB.*, V, 1939, pp. 1-131.
3. *AB.*, XII, No. 336, 388; and *Bull. DCRI*, II, pp. 212-14.
4. Hazra, *Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, Dacca, 1940.
5. Patil, 'Gupta Inscriptions and Puranic Traditions', *Bull. DCRI*, II, p. 148 and Appendix.
6. *AB.*, IV, No. 356; V, No. 394; X, No. 471; VII, No. 414
7. *AB.*,
8. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 244.
9. *Ibid.*, III, No. 340; IV, No. 313; VII, Nos. 353, 381; IX, No. 408; XII, No. 353; *Ind. Cul.*, IV, p. 216; V, pp. 328 and 443

Among the few new inscriptions mention must be made of the Mathurā Inscription of Candragupta II[1] which is not only the earliest record of the king, but is also important for the antiquity of Lakulīśa cult. Another equally important inscription is the record of Narendravarman, being the second earliest inscription in the Vikrama era[2].

The coins present a few rare types. Distinct addition to Gupta monuments was made by Banerji's discovery of a temple and other sculptures at Bhumara, and elsewhere in its vicinity[3] Jayaswal's identification of certain sculptures from the same area as Gupta-Vākāṭaka[4] and by the recent chance digging up of Gupta floor-levels and terra cottas from Rājghāṭ at Benares.[5]

The rest of the work in Gupta history consists of interpretation of the existing material. General works like Banerji's *The Age of the Imperial Guptas*,[6] Jayaswal's, *History of India*,[7] Iyengar's *Studies in Gupta History*,[8] Codrington's *Ancient India*,[9] Basak's *The History of North-Eastern India*,[10] Saletore's *Social Life During the Gupta Period*[11] treat, besides political history, several other topics as art, architecture, administration and literature.

A majority of individual studies pertain to the discussions of Samudragupta's conquests and identification of countries and peoples occurring therein.[12] A few articles are devoted to other Gupta kings : Candragupta II,[13] and Bālāditya[14] while a number of articles deal with King Candra of the Meharauli inscription,[15] and

---

1. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 245; XII, No. 262.
2. The writer had occasion to see this inscription when it was being purchased for the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. It is being edited by Mr. S. N. Chakravarti in the *Epigraphia Indica.*
3. *AB.*, I, No. 100,
4. *JBORS.*, and III, No. 199; V, No. 185; VII, No. 211; VIII, No. 146,
5. *J. U. P. His. Soc.*,
6. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 320.
7. *Ibid.*, II, No. 320,
8. *Ibid.*, II, No. 320
9. *Ibid.*, IV., No. 100 a ; see also SK. Saraswati, *JISOA.*, VIII, pp. 46-58.
10. *Ibid.*, No. 370.
11. (To be published shortly).
12. *Ibid.*, VII, Nos. 339, 427, 483, 485, 528; IX, No. 500; VIII, No. 367; IX, Nos. 346, 466; II, No. 344; III, No. 370; XII, Nos. 335, 427, 429.
13. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 380, IX, No. 409; *NIA.*, II, p. 685.
14. *Ibid.*, II, No. 348.
15. *Ibid.*, III, No. 245; XII, Nos. 251—52, 301; *NIA*, I, p. 188; *Ind. Cul.*, V, p. 206.

the Gupta era. Views have been expressed that the Gupta era is identical with the Vikrama era of 58 B. C.[1], or that its initial year is 272-273 A. D.[2] while others uphold the old view of Fleet.[3] A couple of articles emphasize the religious toleration during the Gupta period.[4]

A reference to the Vākāṭakas has already been made before. Their history on which hardly a line is found in works of the first quarter of this century has been brought into greater relief by the efforts of several scholars from different sources. Before Jayaswal with his interpretation of Puranic and inscriptional references claimed a proud place for them in early Indian history scholars[5] had already begun to take interest in them and drawn attention to their high family relations. Jayaswal's theories of Vākāṭāka sovereignty,[6] etc. came as a bomb-shell and were immediately opposed by some scholars[7]. The Vākāṭaka chronology capitals, etc. have continued to be discussed[8].

The Vākāṭakas have not profited from interpretation alone. A number of new inscriptions[9] of the dynasty have been found whereas Wellsted[10] and Jayaswal[11] have discovered a few monuments.

North Indian history after the disruption of the Gupta Empire on the death of Skandagupta, up to the rise of Harṣa, that is from c. 480 A. D. to c. 600 A. D., for a period of about 120 years, is still in a nebulous state. We knew of the Hūṇa invasion under Mihirakula, of the meteoric rise of Yaśovardhana, of the quarrels of the Later Guptas, Maukhāris and the Varddhanas and the establishment of the Valabhī kingdom in Surāṣṭra during this interregnum. This state has not materially changed. For not much material has come forth which could enable scholars to define things more preci-

---

1. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 328.
2. *Ibid..*, VII, No. 330.
3. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 324, XI, 364; *NIA.*, III, p. 419, see also *Ind. Cul..* V, p. 114 and 335.
4. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 352, 364 and *IHQ.*, XV, pp. 1—12.
5. *AB.*, I, No. 244, 247, 251, 254, 260 ; II, No. 352, III, No. 337.
6. *History of India*, Lahore 1933, *AB.*, VIII, No. 355.
7. *AB.*, X, Nos. 410, 411, IX, No. 470.
8. *AB.*, X, Nos. 345; XI, 362 a : 10th *AJOCR.*, p. 455, and *JNSI.*, II, p. 92.
9. *Ibid.*, II, Nos. 246, 284 ; III, Nos. 246, 274, XI, Nos. 328, 330; XII, Nos. 281, 282, *NIA.*, II, pp. 177, 721 ; *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 182.
10. *Ibid.*, IX, Nos. 486, 492.
11. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 156.

sely. No doubt a few more inscriptions of the Later Guptas have been found; the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, a contemporary Buddhist literary source is studied and an inscription of a Yaśovarmadeva discovered. But these do not help us much. The research has therefore tended towards the clarification of the existing material. Banerji has discussed the question of the succession of the Later Guptas, Mookerji the question how far they were kings of Malwa and of Magadha and Raychaudhari examined both these new studies accepting partly the conclusions of Banerji.[1] The Maukhari history has been clearly stated by Pires and Tripathi[2]; whereas others have discussed problems of their succession, origin and survial.[3]

Two monographs have been written on Harṣa[4]; individual articles have discussed the extent of his empire : some hold that it embraced a greater part of northern India, others refute such a claim, while the third view has adduced epigraphical evidence to show that Harṣa conquered the Pallava Mahendravarman.[5] Śaśāṅka, Harṣa's senior contemporary, has also received some attention from scholars.[6] Harṣa's relation with Christianity has also been discussed,[7] and so also certain other problems of his reign.[8] A reference to Harṣa's seal has been traced in the *Harṣacarita*,[9] whereas his seal has been found at Nālandā,[10] proving his contact with this seat of learning.

Hirananda Sastri, the editor of the Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarmadeva,[11] identified this king with Yasovardhana, but this has raised a storm of criticism from some scholars.[12] Hence the value of this record for political history is uncertain.

---

1. *AB.*, III, No. 344 ; IV, Nos. 369, 388, and in the latest (4th) ed. of the *Political History respectively*; see also *Ind. Cul.*, V, p. 425.
2. *Ibid.*, IX, Nos. 425 ; 475 respectively.
3. *Ibid.*, XI, No, 367; X, Nos. 474, 479 and *NIA.*, II, p. 354 respectively
4. *Ibid.*, Nos. 268, 272.
5. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 502; IV, No. 365; I, No. 284 respectively.
6. *Ibid.*, VII, Nos. 342, 352; VIII, No. 405 ; IX, No. 338, No. 412.
7. *AB.*, III, No. 423
8. *Ibid.*, III, Nos. 339, 354 a.
9. *Ibid.*, V, No. 390.
10. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 290.
11. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 280.
12. *Ibid.*, VI, Nos. 245, 260; VII, 289; and also VII, Nos. 274, 195,

The Hūṇa invasion has been discussed by Heras and others.[1] Numerous additional grants of the Maitrakas of Valabhī have been published, of which only one—that of Kharagraha I[2]—adds to our knowledge, as no other grant of this member of the dynasty was previously known. Our knowledge of other details political, social etc.-of the dynasty however remains where it was 25 years ago. The only clarification being the nature and strength of Buddhism at Valabhī.[3] The history of western half of Kathiawar is furnished for the first time by the discovery of six plates of the Jethvās or Saindhavas of Ghumli.[4]

After Harṣa begins the so called Early Mediaeval or Early Rajput Period of North India. Smith[5] gave only the bare outline of this period, and that too mentioning a few importnat dynasties. Ray[6] has now told us its political and dynastic history based mainly on the inscriptions of the several dynasties, in fuller details, while other scholars have tried to give a fairely exhaustive cultural history of the Paramāras, Gurjara Pratihāras, Pālas and others.

Of all the early mediaeval kingdoms perhaps the first to rise in Northern India was the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty.

Since the days of Hoernle and Smith several scholars have written about it discussing the questions of its origin,[7] early capitals,[8] relations with the Arabs, later chronology,[9] the extent of its empire[10] and identification of some of its rulers.[11]

The Pālas, the eastern contemporaries of the Gurjara Pratihāras, have been studied from a wider angle.[12] The excavations at Nālandā in Bihar and at Paharpur in Bengal, and finds at Kur-

---

1. *Ibid.*, X, No. 480; *NIA.*, IV, p. 36.
2. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 313.
3. *AB.*, XI, No. 179; and Sankalia, *Buddha Prabhā*, April 1939, p. 1127 and *IHQ.*, *XVI.*, pp. 816-818.
4. *ASI. AR.*, 1936-37, p. 102, and *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXVI.
5. *EHI*, (4th ed.), pp. 374 ff.
6. *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vols. I-II.
7. *AB.*, III, No. 365; VI, No. 425: IX. Nos. 368. 370, 403, 452; XII, No. 379, Nos. X., Nos. 392, 393, 400.
8. *Ibid.*, VI, Nos. 343, 466 a.
9. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 379; *IHQ.*, XIV, p. 813
10. *Ibid.*, III, No. 331
11. *Ibid*, II, No. 319; III, No. 336.
12. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 446; *IHQ.*, XV, p. 595.

kihar and other places in both these provinces have not only added archaeological material for the study of the material culture of the period and the country, but new inscriptions have been found which throw light on the political and cultural connections of Bengal and of Further India. Both the inscriptions and sculptures are intensively studied. The former have been edited in a seperate volume[1] ; the latter have been examined and correlated with similar sculptures from India and Java by several scholars.[2] Beside these studies, the old unsolved problems, of chronology,[3] extent of the Pāla empire[4] etc. have also received considerable attention. The Pāla period has also gained considerably by the numerous publications on Tantrism which had developed in Bihar and Bengal under the kings of these dynasties.

The studies in the Senas, the successors of the Pālas, have been carried on similar lines. Here too the controversial points are the foundation of the Lakṣmaṇasena era,[5] Sena chronology,[6] the location of their capital[7] and the origin of the Senas and Varmans[8]. Contemporary or a little later literature has also greatly elucidated the Sena history[9] The ancient geography of Bengal has been clarified by a grant of Lakṣmaṇasena[10].

Since 1924 when Smith's Fourth Edition of the *Early History of India* was published a number of inscriptions of other mediæval dynasties-Paramāras, Haihayas. Candelas, Gāhadvalas, Caulukyas (Solaṅkīs), Cāhamānas, Guhilots, and others have been published. These have been listed by Bhandarkar[11]. But so far no comprehensive history, correlating the epigraphical, literary, archaeological

---

1. Mujumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vols. I-III.
2. *Ibid.*, III, No. 105; V, No. 189; Kempers pp. 151-178; The Bronzes of Nālandā and Hindu Javanese Art and XII, No. 378.
3. *AB.*, VI. Nos. 342, 438; VII, No. 261; IV, No. 302, V. 323; VIII, No. 339; *Ind. Cul.*, *VI*, p. 113; pp. 203-220.
4. *Ibid.*, X, No. 373; No. XI 455.
5. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 315.
6. *Ibid.* No. 322; VII, No. 326; IX, No. 317; XII, No. 313; and *Ind. Cul.*, IV, p. 227.
7. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 390, X, 489.
8. Ibid., No. 411; XII, No. 364; IHQ., XIII, 158., *Ind. Cul.*, VI, pp. 53-60; 467-70.
9. *Ibid.*, V, No. 468; IX, No. 362.
10. *Ibid.*, X, No. 267.
11. See Note 4., p. 1.

and other material of any of these dynasties has been written. After Ray's[1] detailed political outline of the Paramāra dynasties of Malwa and Rajputana, Ganguly's[2] is the only work on the subject. This is complete as far as it goes, but it fails to correlate the archæological material.

Likewise the writer's work[3], while it uses the archæological sources has not exhauased all the literary. and folklore sources for the political and cultural history of the Caulukyas of Gujarat. Within recent years the most important discovery is the find of a copper plate of the Prince Cāmuṇḍa[4]. Not only it is a distinct gain to Caulukya political history, but its Jain method of writing, so different from the hitherto published inscriptions of the dynasty, and the mention of the Gupta era as being equivalent to that of the Vikrama raise important problems in Gujarat epigrapay and Indian eras respectively. So also the work of the Baroda archæological Survey. Systematic listing of monuments, taluka by taluka, is revealing, if not always new monuments, the wide extent of the different types of Caulukya monuments and the various cults flourishing within the empire.

In Haihaya (Cedi or Kalacchuri) History, the most exhaustive account is that of Banerji[5] where the author has discussed a number of new inscriptions and monuments discovered by him. Beside this there are a few articles dealing with the history of the dynasty.[6]

The Gāhaḍvālas of Kanauj, besides being discussed by Ray, have received a more detailed treatment from Tripathi[7]; whereas a few other scholars[8] have also sketched their history.

Ray's seems to be the only detailed account of the Candelas (Candrātreyas) of Jejabhukti, after Smith. Its sculpture however has drawn considerable attention from students of art.[9]

---

1. *Dynastic History* of *Northern India.*
2. *History of the Paramara Dynasty*, 1933.
3. *The Archaelogy of Gujarat*, 1941.
4. *Bhāratīya Vidyā* (Hindi), 1940-41,
5. *The Haihayas of Tripuri and their monuments*, *MASI*, No. 23, 1931; *AB*, VII, No. 101.
6. *AB.*, II, No. 351; III, No. 374; V, No. 412; VI, No. 440; XII, No. 349; *IHQ*, XVII, p. 117.
7. *History of Kanauj.*,
8. *AB.*, IV, No. 404; VIII, No. 259; XI, No. 413.
9. *AB. JRAS.*, 1940.

The work on the Cauhan (Cāhamana) history is also not much. A few articles pertain to the chronological study of the dynasty,[1] while only one pertains to its cultural aspect[2].

The Guhilots of Mewar have also not attracted many scholars.[3] The one interesting topic in their history is their alleged connexion with the rulers of Valabhī[4].

The Āndhras may be said to begin, in our present state of knowledge, the independent history of southern India, that is, country south of the Vindhyas. For though they are supposed to have supplanted the Kāṇva dynasty in northern India, and though coins and a few inscriptions bearing Āndhra-Sātavāhana names are found from Central India, all available evidence goes to show that it was the present Āndhra Deśa and the Deccan which were directly one time or another under the Āndhras. Varied sources—Purāṇas, inscriptions, monuments and coins, foreign and Indian classical literature existed and were known and used 25 years ago to elucidate their history. But inspite of such wealth of material, the problems like their caste and chronology, their relations with the Western Kṣatrapas and Kṣaharātas, had not been satisfactorily solved. It is these and other—identification of places mentioned in Sātavāhana inscriptions—which have been tackled and yet left as they were for want of conclusive evidence. Of course, to these questions of caste or name,[5] chronology[6], Śaka–Sātavāhana relations,[7] geography[8] etc., new orientation is sought by a more sympathetic but at times uncritical study of the Purāṇas[9]. There are two comprehensive restatements of the entire subject, studying in great detail some problems, by Subramanian[10] and Gopalachari[11]. While

---

1. AB., V, No. 378; No. 303; VIII, Nos. 344, 381; *IHQ.*, IV, p. 844; XVI, p. 567, p. 738.
2. *IHQ.*, XV, p. 622
3. *AB.*, XII, No. 332
4. *AB.*, XI, No. 337.
5. AB., V, No. 462; X, 401; *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 560; *Ind. Cul.*, V, p. 17.
6. *AB.*, III, No. 434, (see also under 3); IV, No. 427, V. Nos. 440, 493; IX, No. 467.
7. *Ibid.*, I, No. 283; III, No. 342; V, Nos. 364, 393; VI, Nos. 339, 363; VII, Nos. 382, 447.
8. *Ibid.*, I, Nos. 176, 255, 294; III, No. 444; XI, No. 452.
9. Bose, ' Reconstruction of the Andhra Chronology ', *JRASB*, 1939.
10. *AB.*, VII, No. 167.
11. *Early History of the Andhra Country, Madras*, 1941.

these studies have not led to any startling results, data for the Āndhra material culture has been provided by excavations at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Candravali, Brahmagiri, Paithan and Kondapur[1]. Numerous finds have also been made of Āndhra coins[2], among which a unique coin of Apilika[3] deserves notice. The old and newly-found sculptures[4] as well as inscriptions[5] from Amarāvati, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and other places within the Āndhra empire have been subjected to critical study to throw light on all the various aspects of the culture of the period.

Of late successors of the Āndhras or Sātavāhanas have drawn the attention they deserve. For unless their political and cultural history is properly laid bare we cannot appreciate that of their successors-the Kadambas, Cālukyas and Pallavas. We have now in addition to Sarcar's outline[6] separate studies of the Ābhiras[7], Viṣṇukuṇḍians[8], and the Sālaṅkāyanas[9] bassed on new inscriptions.

Kadambas, one of the of the successors of the Sātavāhanas in Karṇāṭaka have been brought into prominence which has long eluded them. Whereas they were barely heard of previously, an entire monograph based on fresh discoveries of inscriptions and monuments and study of the old material now exists, owing to efforts of Heras[10] and Moraes[11]. A few other scholars are also interested in their study[12]. Among the discovery of inscriptions[13] published since Moraes' comprehensive work, the most important is

---

1, *ABORI.*, XXII, 1941, pp. 171-185.

2. *AB.*, II, No. 430; V, Nos. 508, 513, IX, Nos. 535, 549, 533, and Mirashi, ; *JNSI.*, II, 1940, pp. 83-94.

3. *AB.*, No. 433.

4. *AB.*, III, Nos. 144, 167; V, Nos. 156, 174, 192, 397; IX, Nos. 225, 226 VIII, Nos. 142, 207 and *Bull. DCRI.*, Vol. II. (1940-41), pp. 50-118; 263-299.

5. *Ibid.*, VIII, 301; IX, No. 257, and *Bull. DCRI.*, Vol. III, 1942, pp. 349-391.

6. *Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan*, 1935.

7. AB., X, No. 483.

8. *Ibid.*, V, No. 305; IX, No. 483; X, Nos. 356, 358, 475, 484; VI, No. 276; VIII, No. 417; XII, Nos. 297, 366.

9. *Ibid.*, V, No. 306, X, No. 355, VIII, No. 295; IX, No. 432.

10. *AB.*, IV, No. 124.

11. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 389.

12. Ibid., VI, No. 422; VIII, Nos. 308, 341; VII, No. 416; IX, No. 318 ; Nos. 354, 365; XII, No. 304; *Ind. Cul.*, IV, p. 118, p. 355; V, p. 115.

13. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 281, *NIA.*, IV, p. 198 and p. 181.

that of Mayuraśarmā himself, found by the Mysore Archæological Department.

Contribution to our knowledge of the political history of the Western Cālukyas was slight inspite of new inscriptions[1] till last year when an inscription of Pulakeśin I was discovered at Bādāmi[2]. This definitely proves that the dynasty was in possession of Bādāmi and considerable part of Karnataka before Maṅgaleśa. Welcome likewise was the discovery of paintings[3] in these caves and publication of monographs dealing with sculptures[4] and temples[5] of the dynasty. Other studies are few and relate mainly to Pulakesin II and Harṣa[6].

Interest in the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, who dethroned the Cālukyas in the Deccan and Karṇāṭaka, has also been evinced. Altekar[7] has put together all the available material on them except their monuments; other aspects—their ancestry[8] etc. have also been discussed by scholars. But besides this the main addition to the history of the period is the find of new inscriptions,[9] the most important of which are the Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarṣa, and the Surat plates of Karkkarāja Suvarṇavarṣa. For the former is the first genuine record of Amoghavarṣa and takes back the antiquity of Sanjan to the 9th century; while the latter is the first document informing us of the Jain temple at Navsāri (Nāgasārikā).

Karṇāṭaka once again passed into the hands of the descendants of the Cālukyas, known as Cālukyas of Kalyāṇī. Owing to the efforts of the Archaeological Survey we now know something about their monuments; a few more inscriptions have also been found[10], but their political as well cultural history yet remains to be thoroughly explored, the interest so far shown being in certain political questions only[11].

---

1. *AB.*, I, Nos. 195, 47 ; III, Nos. 254, 258, 315, IX, Nos. 297,———295, 319.
2. The discovery was announced in the Bombay Government, *News Bulletin.*
3. *AB.*, XI, No. 231. (*JISOA.*, IV, pp. 57-61).
4. Banerji, *Bas reliefs at Badami*, *MASI*, 1928, and *AB.*, IV, No. 157 VIII, No. 136.
5. Cousens, *Chalukyan Architecture*, 1926.
6. *AB.*, VI, No. 368; VII, Nos. 336, 439; No. X 473; *Ind. Cul.*, VI, p. 448.
7. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 334.
8. *Ibid.*, IX, Nos. 359, 454; XII, No. 397
9. *AB.*, I, Nos. 182, 191, 256; II, No. 230; IV, No. 281; VI, Nos. 274, 248, 257, 266, 298, 306, 325, 507; IX, Nos. 285, 298; XII, Nos. 260, 283
10. *AB.*, I, No. 196; II, No. 283; III, Nos. 286, 292; IV, Nos, 243, 244, 265, 278; V, No. 312; XI, No. 351; XII, Nos. 258-59, 2J1, 291.
11. *AB.* VIII, Nos. 371, 376, 442; IX, No. 343; XII, Nos. 355, 356; *IHQ.*, XIV, p. 613; XVII, p. 11; *Ind. Cul.*, IV, p. 43.

In the Eastern Deccan ruled the Eastern Cālukyas, Gaṅgās and other minor dynasties. Of these outline history of the Cālukyas is sketched by Ganguly[1], whereas a few other scholars have touched the questions of chronology[2]. More inscriptions have also been published[3], whereas there is mention of the coins of Viṣṇuvardhana[4].

As of the Cālukyas, so also of the Gaṅgas there were two dynasties; the Eastern and the Western. On the latter we now have a small monograph by Rao[5]. He has also written on their architecture[6]. A few articles discuss their chronology, origin[7], marriage relations and geography[8].

Of the Eastern Gaṅgas a number of inscriptions have been published. Their history is narrated briefly by Rao[9]. But the most hotly discussed point is the initial date of the Gaṅga era[10]. After re-examining all the views as well as his own previous views Subba Rao has fixed it at 509 A. D[11].

Since Fleet and Bhandarkar wrote much material has been gathered for the history of the Śilāhāras, Yādavas, Kākatīyas and the Hoysalas who between them ruled over parts of the Konkan, Deccan and Karnataka, from the 11th to the 14th century. This material is mostly in the form of inscriptions and monuments. The Hyderabad Archælogical Department has recovered the Kākatīya monuments at Warangal, Palampet and other places as well as published their inscriptions, whereas the Mysore Archaeological Department has brought to light the monuments and inscriptions of the Hoysalas. Individual efforts in elucidating the history of these dynasties are not wanting, though there is not much[12] that can be said about them. The Kākatīyas in this respect

1. *The Eastern Cālukyas*, 1937.
2. *AB.*, Nos. 350, 375, XII, No. 323.
3. *Ibid.*, III, Nos. 289, 300, 314; IV, No. 280; V, Nos. 309, 310; XI, No. 343; IX, No. 299; XII, No. 288.
4. *Ibid.*, III, No. 451.
5. *Ibid.*, X, No. 451 (*The Gaṅgās of Talkad*).
6. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 179; X, No. 182,
7. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 331; IX, No. 319; XII, No. 319; XI, No. 379.
8. *Ibid.*, III, No. 395 and 433 respectively.
9. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 421; VII, No. 424; VIII, No. 396; XII, No. 370.
10. *Ibid.*, VI, Nos. 297, 300; VII, No. 325; IX, Nos. 321–22; XII, No. 316.
11. *Tenth All India Oriental Conference Proceedings and Transactions*, 1940, p. 477.
12. *Ind. Cul.*, V, p. 17.

are better studied than the rest. Besides the publication of their inscriptions[1] and short articles dealing with their chronology and political history,[2] scholars have tried to throw light on them from Tamil[3] and Sanskrit literature[4] and from the accounts of foreign travellers[5] and coins.[6]

The Yādava-Śilāhāra history is being systematically studied. So far the main addition to Fleet-Bhandarkar's political outline is the publication of their inscriptions[7] and monuments.[8]

Immense strides have been made in the study of purely south Indian dynasties, especially the Pallava. Though the chronological gap between the earlier and later Pallava dynasties is not yet satisfactorily filled, in spite of some very systematic attempts to do so, as also the question of Pallava origins, still we have now a number of monographs dealing with several aspects of their political and cultural history. Early Pallavas,[9] their origin[10] their relation with the Colas[11] their connection with the later Pallavas,[12] their Nāga affinities[13] and their wars with the Cālukyas[14] have been discussed exhaustively by several scholars. Gopalan[15] dealt with their general history, while recently Minakshi[16] wrote on their social and cultural history, and Chhabra[17] on the cultural relations between South India and Further India during the Pallava rule. Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava saints of the period have also received attention[18]. Pallava monuments have also been widely studied.

1. *AB.*, II, No. 285; V, Nos. 285, 298; VII, No. 308; VIII, No. 286.
2. *AB.*, VI, No. 417; VII, No. 421; IV, No. 382; VI, No. 418; VIII, No. 393; XI, Nos. 405, 485; 10th *A. I. O. C. R.*, p. 423.
3. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 358.
4. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 363.
5. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 458.
6. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 510.
7. Yādava: *AB.*, II, Nos. 235, 236, 250; III, Nos. 250, 252, 261; IV, No. 242; VIII, Nos. 287, 293; *EP. Ind.*, XXIII, No. 43.
Śilāhara: *AB.*, III, Nos. 257, 269; *EP. Ind.*, XXIII, No. 44.
8. Cousens, *Mediaeval Temples of the Dakhan*, and *Bull. DCRI.*, I, pp. 169-177 and II, pp. 218-225.
9. *AB.*, I, No, 235; IX, No. 384; X, No. 472; IX, No. 325.
10. *Ibid.*, V, No. 442; XI, 420; No:
11. *AB.*, VII, No. 419.
12. *Ibid.* VI, No. 356; VII, No. 45; VIII, No. 380; IX, No. 421; X, No. 443.
13. *Ibid.*, II, No. 387
14. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 346; IX, No. 383; XI, No. 479.
15. *Ibid.*, III, No. 263
16.
17. *AB.*, IX, No. 668.
18. *AB.*, II, Nos, 306, 311, 312, 316.

Besides general articles on the Māhabalipuram rock-temples[1] there are articles discussing particular panels-usually that which shows a person practising penance[2], or the royal statues[3]. Monographs[4] describe the Pallava architecture of all the three periods, while recently the hitherto unidentified sculptures in the Rājasiṁha temple, Kāñcī, have been identified by Minakshi[5]. Important too is the discovery of Pallava paintings[6] as well as of a few new inscriptions[7].

The Colas is another such dynasty about which new discoveries of inscriptions, coins, monuments, and paintings coupled with a critical study of these as well as literary sources have thrown immense light. The political, administrative, economic, social and other aspects of cultural life of South India from about 800 A. D. to 1200 A. D. have been pictured before us about which we knew very little 25 years ago. More colour is added to this picture from archaeological work[8] in Farther India-Ceylon, Indian Archaepelago, and French Indo-China. Works[9] of Sastri exhaustively treat of entire Cola period, whereas a number of scholars have discussed individual kings like Kullottuṅga[10], Rājādhirāja II[11] or the Cola invasion of Bengal[12], the struggle with the Śailandras[13]. Economic conditions have been discussed by Sastri[14], Appadorai and Govindaswami.

Numerous Cola inscriptions have been published while a number of articles deal with the discovery of new Cola temples[15], bronze

1. *AB.*, III, No. 81, 108, 146; IV, Nos. 80; VII, Nos. 206, 208.
2. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 246, 248; IX, No. 207, and I, Nos. 111, 112; VIII, No. 166.
3. *Ibid.*, I, No. 129; IX, No. 223, and II, No. 139; III, No. 175; V, No. 164,
4. Longhurst, *Pallava Architecture MASI.*, Nos. 17, 33, 40.
5. *MASI.*, No. 63 (1941).
6. *AB.*, IX, No. 207.
7. *Ibid.*, III, No. 299; IX, No. 296; XI, 292,
8. This has been omitted from this sketch-survey.
9. *Studies in Cola History and Administration*, 1932. *The Colas*, Vol. I, and II, 1935 and 1937.
10. *AB.*, II, No. 390.
11. *Ibid.*, III, No, 360; X, No, 337; XI, No. 407; VIII, No. 353; VI, No, 398.
12. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 412; XII, No. 381; No. 364; XII, Nos. 327-328.
13. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 649; VII, No. 359; VI, No. 315.
14. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 203, 346; XII, No. 331; VII, No. 374.
15. *AB.*, IX, No. 152; XII, No. 173; XI, No. 163.

and stone images[1] and frescoes[2] and coins[3]. The discovery of temples and frescoes in the Pudukota State enable us to study the evolution of the mediaeval South Indian temple from the Pallava temples of the earlier period; from the frescoes the extension of the Ajanta art.

The Pandyas and Ceras, other ancient kingdoms of South India, have not been so extensively studied. Sastri wrote a small monograph[4] on the former, while others have written briefly on their monuments and inscriptions[5]. Aiyar has written a similar monograph on the early Ceras[6], while a few other have discussed the Cera chronology[7], Cera capitals etc[8]. However the work of newly opened Archaeological Department of the Travancore State, which has already gathered a number of inscriptions and examined different kinds of monuments is sure to supply abundant material for the history of these corners of South India which till now have been rather neglected.

Nothing however that has been achieved in other periods of Indian History can compare with what has been done for Vijayanagara history. It has been really invaded by scholars from many directions using archaeological, mainly inscriptional-Tamil, Telugu, Kanerese, Sanskrit-as well as foreign sources in Portuguese and Dutch. Sewell remembered the Empire. Scholars have now ransacked the political, administrative, and social history of its various dynasties. After Sewell, Heras[9] wrote on the Aravidu Dynasty and the Beginnings of Vijayanagara history; Venkata Ramanayya[10] on Kampila and Vijayanagara, Studies in the Third Dynasty, and Origin of the City and the Empire; Saletore[11] on Social and Political Life; and Mahalingam[12] on Administration etc. Beside these scholars, other scholars have written on the question of the origin

---

1. *AB.*, III, Nos, 170-172; V, No. 167; VIII, No, 149; IX, No. 162; XII, No 223.
2. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 192, 206; IX, Nos. 200, 215; X, No. 20C; XI, No. 235.
3. *Ibid*,, II, Nos, 414, 417, 419, 420, 427, 428.
4. *The Pandyan Kingdom.*
5. *Ibid.*, No. 231.
6. Cera Kings of the Sangam Period, 1937, AB, XII, No. 329.
7. *Madras University Journal*, 1942, AB.,
8. *AB.*, I, Nos. 174, 224; X, Nos. 497, 532.
9. *AB.*, II, No. 345; V, No. 346.
10. *Ibid.*, V, No. 434; No. 452; VIII, No. 391.
11. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 443.
12. *Administration and Social Life*, Madras, 1941.

and foundation of Vijayanagara[1], on Kṛṣṇadevarāya[2] and other kings[3], on the relations of Vijayanagara and their feudatories[4] or contemporaries[5], on Vijayanagara polity[6], on the embassies at Vijayanagara[7], on religious toleration[8], on the geography[9] of the Vijayanagara Empire, and on the causes of its downfall[10]. In this large range of subjects one feels the absence of truly archæological studies. Let alone Chandragiri, Kalahasti, and other places of the empire, Vijayanagara itself is a museum of architectural and sculptural antiquities. More antiquities—pottery and other kinds etc. are likely to be found if excavations are undertaken at the numerous mounds which are strewn with, no doubt, potsherds of the period. What is expected is a comprehensive monograph on the archæology of Vijayanagara, setting out the architecture, sculpture, iconography, etc., correlating them at the same time with the works on these subjects. For by the Vijayanagara period most of the canonical works we know of were composed whereas Vijayanagara marks the end of all truly independent Indian creation. The work so far done embraces either the general description of the ruins at Hampi[11], or a few images[12], coins[13] and paintings[14].

Having thus surveyed in outline the progress in political history, it now remains to review briefly its cultural counterpart. Of course some aspects of the latter-administration, architecture, sculpture etc., have already been mentioned wherever they could be assigned definitely to dynastic periods. In this section it is intended to look as a whole at the several aspects of cultural history, and define its chief tendencies.

A desire to know, understand and interpret Indian culture within and without India through its ancient political history seems to be one of the chief characteristics of the recent works on the subject. At times no doubt the writer being pro-Indian or otherwise,

1. *AB.*, Nos. 370, 383; V, No. 376; VI, No. 419; VII, No. 442; IX, No. 433; XII, No. 391; *Ind. Cul.*, VI, p. 107, 244.
2. *Ibid.*, II, No. 310; III, No. 402; V, No. 430; VI, Nos. 359, 410; XI, No. 236 a, 445; XII, Nos. 369, 387; *IHQ.*, XVII, p. 97.
3. *Ibid.*, III, No. 415; V, No. 380.
4. *Ibid.*, Nos. 373, 404
5. *Ibid.*, II, No. 325, VII, No. 538.
6. *Ibid.*, VI, No. 335.
7. *NIA.*, p. 229,
8. *IHQ.*, XIII, p. 225.
9. *AB.*, VIII, No. 397; XI, No. 513.
10. *Ibid.*, II, No. 321, IX, No. 479.
11. *AB.*, III, No. 134.
12. *Ibid.*, III, No. 369; X, Nos. 272, 274; VI, No. 235; XII, No. 226.
13. *Ibid.*, III, No. 447; IV, No. 430; XI, No. 535.
14. *Ibid.*, XI, Nos. 236, 238.

or led away by his own prejudices has not done justice to his theme. Nevertheless we now find attempts at understanding India not only by Indians themselves, but also by several foreigners–such as the Germans, the French, and the Japanese where formerly, owing to the paucity of material and dearth of interest in things Indian, scarcely any work existed besides Dutt's history and a few other works.

Among the works by Indians in English mention may be made of the works of Majumdar[1], Mookerji[2], Rangacharya[3], Sarkar[4], Shah[5], Vaidya[6]. and Venkateshwara[7]. These books lay stress on the cultural contribution of India in the field of literature, architecture, sculpture and fine arts, using the political history only as a background.

In Hindi we have two works by Jayachandra Vidyalankara.[8] Havell, a very sympathetic Englishman, wrote a similar book in 1924,[9] besides his specialized books on Indian architecture. After him we had a work from Codrington,[10] (a reference to which has already been made, and lately by Moreland and Chatterjee[11] and Rawlinson.[12] The French works are by Comte Goblet[13], Courtiller,[14] Masson-Oursel and others[15]; The German by Alfons Vath[16]; the Japanese by Otoyo Tanaka.[17]

Regional studies or studies pertaining to important ancient sites have also come to the fore–a very welcome development in historical studies. For it is such detailed and specialized works

---

1. *Outline of Indian History and Civilisation*, Calcutta, 1927.

2. *Hindn Civilization from the Earliest Times upto the establishment of the Maurya Empire*, New York, 1936.

3. *History of Pre-Musalman India*, Vol, I. 1929; Vol. II, 1937.

4. *Creative India from Mohenjo-daro to the age of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda*, Lahore, 1937.

5. *The splendour that was Ind.*, Bombay, 1930.

6. *History of Mediaeval India*, Poona, 1926.

7. *Indian Culture through the Ages*, VOL. I, 1928, Vol. II, 1932.

8. *Bhāratīya Itihāsa ki Rūparekhā*, Allahabad, 1933; *Bhāratabhhūmi aur usake Nivasi*, Agra, 1932.

9. *A short History of India.*

10. *Ancient India.* 11. *A short History of India*, London, 1936.

12, *A Short Cultural History*, London, 1937.

13. *Ce que l'Inde doit á la Grèce*, Paris, 1926.

14. *Les anciennes civilisations de l'Inde*, Paris, 1930.

15. *L'Inde antique et la civilisation indienne*, Paris, 1930.

16. *Die Inder*, Freiburg, 1934.

17. *Jodai no Indo* (Ancient India) Tokio, 1937 ; *AB*, XII, No. 392.

which will ultimately lead to the understanding of Indian culture and the part played therein by each region or place.

Among such studies Eastern India seems to have received more attention. Monahan wrote the *Early History of Bengal*[1]; Stapelton and Sarkar on its important landmarks[2], others on its political relations[3], on its different districts[4] and on its art[5].

The Glories of Magadha (Bihar) and Nālandā have been recounted by Samaddar and the writer respectively[6]; of Orissa by Mazumdar and Banerji[7].

Barua[8], Bhuyan[9] and Bhattacharya[10] between them have given us a connected account of Assam from the earliest times to the 19th century, whereas a systematic exploration of the province has also been taken up by the Archaeological Survey[11].

In addition to the books already existing on Nepal by European writers[12] we have now a work on it by Jayaswal[13], which deals with the Licchavis, Thakruis and other rulers of Nepal till 880 A. D.

Accounts of Chamba and Kumaon, other Himalayan places in the Himalayan terrain, have been given by Vogel[14] and others; whereas antiquities of Kashmir and Jammu have been listed by Kak[15].

Along with these works should be mentioned Barua's *Gaya and Buddha Gaya* and Law's *Śrāvastī in Indian Literature*[16].

---

1. *AB.*, I, 267.
2. *AB.*, VIII, No. 418; VI, No. 427.
3. *Ibid.*, VII, No. 370; XI, Nos. 437-38; *IHQ.* XV, p. 122; p. 507; XVI, p. 179
4. *Ibid.*, No. 436, 491 ; IV, No, 142; *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 219.
5. *Ibid.*, IV, Nos. 135, 148; VII, Nos. 115, 185.
6. *The Glories of Magadha*, Calcutta, 1926; *The University of Nālandā*, Madras, 1934.
7. *Orissa in the Making*, Calcutta, 1925; *History of Orissa*, Vol. I, 1930, Vol. II, 1931.
8. *Early History of Kamarupa*, Shillong, 1933.
9. *Kachari Buranji*, Assam, 1936; *Tungakhungia Buranji*, 1933; *Asamar Padya Buranji* (AB., XI, Nos. 398, 400, 401).
10. *Kamarupa Sāsanāvali*, 1931 (*AB.*, VIII, No. 250.)
11.
12.
13. *The Chronology and History of Nepal.*
14. *AB.*, IV, No. 351; V, No. 427.
15. *AB.*, VIII, Nos. 157-58.
16. *AB.*, VII, No. 104; XI, No. 502; respectively.

History of the Madhyadésa, the area covering parts of the present Central and United Provinces and Malwa is found in the works of Altekar[1], Banerji[2], Ganguli[3], Ghosh[4], Ray[5] and Tripathi[6], and articles by these scholars[7]. Ojha[8] has told in several volumes the story of Rajputana's numerous States. To this may be added Reu's[9] history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (or Rathods), whereas the writer[10] has reconstructed Gujarat's cultural history from archaeological sources. A brief account of Sind's early history is found in Cousen's *Antiquities of Sind* and Ray's *Dynastic History of Northern India*[11].

On the Deccan there has been no work dealing with cultural history in its entirety. Jouveau Dubreuil wrote a small monograph and recently Sarkar has written on its certain dynastic periods whereas Cousens brought together at one place the work done by the Archaeological Survey. A reference to all these works has been made previously.[12] Karṇāṭaka's ancient history has been reconstructed by Saletore[13]; of a part of Mysore-Ikkeri-by Puttana.[14] A collection of its inscriptions have been edited by Panchamukhi, who is also now engaged in a systematic exploration of the region.

Of further South a reference has already been made to the studies of the Pallavas, Colas, Pandyas and Ceras. It would suffice here if attention is drawn to more general or special studies on South India. Among such works we should notice Aravamuthan's *The Kaveri, the Maukharis, and Sangam Age*, Ayyanger's *Manimekhalai*, Dikshitar's *Studies in Tamil Literature and History*, and Pillai's

1. *History of Benares.* (*AB.*, XII, No. 330.)
2. *Haihayas and their Monuments.*
3. *Paramāras*
4. *History of Kauśāmbi.*
5. *Dynastic History of Northern India.*
6. *History of Kanauj*, Benares, 1937.
7. *AB.*, IV, No. 91, VI, No. 455; VII, Nos. 102, No. 392.
8. *The History of Rajputana*,
9. *History of the Rashtrakutas*, 1933.
10. *The Archaeology of Gujarat*, Bombay, 1941.
11. *AB.*, IV, No. 108, see also *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 598, for its conquest by Sasanians and Arab's see *Dr. S. K. Aiyangar Com.* Vol. pp. 11-17; and *10th A. I. O.C.R.*, 1940-41, pp. 403-10.
12. To this should be added Gupte's work on Karhad (in Marathi) Poona, 1929, and works by Rājwade, Kelkar and others in Marathi. An exhaustive classified bibliography is being prepared by the writer's Department.
13. *Ancient Karnataka*, Poona 1936.
14. AB., VII, No. 412.

Tamil's 1800 years Ago, all of which strive to throw light on South Indian history from Tamil literary sources. A few articles[1] relate the history of Rajahmundry, Cochin and Kerala.

There are a few small dynastic studies such as Bhañja Kings[2], Bhadra dynasty of Samatata[3] (E. Bengal), Suketri and Kara dynasties[4] and dynasties of Kalinga[5] and Rewah[5].

Studies of different aspects of Indian culture which could not be noticed before are here grouped under chronology, kings and kingship ; Administration, Revenue, Trade and Commerce, Technical terms in Epigraphy ; Historical Ethnology, Geography, Institutions; Social and Cultural Life from Literature and monuments ; Architecture and Sculpture (including Buddhist, Hindu, Jaina sites and iconography and religions) ; Painting.

Chronological studies have been in two directions. Wijk[6], for instance, has given us Decimal Tables for calculating the exact-details of date from the *Sūryasidhānta*: whereas others[7], among whom Gode[8] has contributed the most, have tried to fix the date of authors, events, and things on the bases of literary references. Among these attempts[9] to fix the dates of poets Māgha, Kālidāsa, and Bhavabhūti deserve notice.

Studies in Indian Polity discuss the theory of kingship, obligations of the state, royal prerogatives and titles[10].

Aiyangar, Dikshitar, Brelore, Sastri and Stein[11] have written on Hindu Administrative Institutions and State administration in Kauṭalya and Cola times respectively.

Hindu Revenue system, economic conditions of ancient India, and the cognate questions of India's commerce with Rome and other Western countries in the early centuries of the Christian era have

1. *AB.*, V, No. 403; *IHQ.*, XIV, p. 503; *AB.*, VIII, No. 424.
2. *AB.*, I, No. 242; IV, No. 97; V, No. 405; VI, No. 350; X, No. 263; XI, No. 418.
3. *AB.* XI, No. 440.
4. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 453; I, No. 233 respectively.
5. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 353, 354, 360; I, No. 285, V, No. 459.
6. *On Hindu Chronology*, AB., Nos. 236–37.
7. *Pillai*, *The chronology of the Early Tamils*, Madras, 1932.
8. See the *Bibliography of his Published writings*, Poona, 1941.
9. *AB.*, I, Nos. 234; No. 350.
10. Besides the works of Beni Prasad, Jayaswal and Dikshitar there have been a few other works recently by Anjaria and others, the exact titles of which I have no means to ascertain at present.
11. *AB.*, V, No. 463; VI, No. 453; VIII, Nos. 283, 399; *NIA.* III, p. 307.

been explored by Ghoshal, Pran Nath, Rawilnson and Warmington[1]. Recently attention has been drawn to similar relations between South India, Africa and China[2].

Literature- Kāmasūtra, Prākṛta Piṅgala etc. have been made the bases of socio-historical studies by Chakladar, Raghavan and others; foreign ambassador's account-Megasthenes'-by Timmer[3]. Similarly Barua, Moti Chandra, Naik and Codrington have elucidated the material culture as portrayed in the sculptures of Bharhut[4] and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa[5] and the frescoes of Ajanta[6].

Attention is being devoted now to historical ethnology-to tracing the antiquity of tribes and peoples and castes mentioned in inscriptions, Purāṇas, and tradition. Major works on these subjects include Law's *Ancient Indian Kṣatriya Tribes*, Saletore's *Wild Tribes in Indian History*, and Narasimhaswami's *The Bhutas*, whereas a number of articles deal with the Bāṇas, Kośars, Palayagars, Mīnas, and Gaudas[7]; others with origin of some castes[8], race drift in South India[9] and personal names in the inscriptions of the Deccan[10].

Some interest has been shown in geographical studies, but except a few cases all the attempts deal with detached places. There has been no attempt to write on the geography of a region or of a dynasty either on the data culled from literature or inscriptions. Cunningham's work is now reedited[11] with all the necessary modifications; so also Dey's[12]. Berthelot has brought out an edition of Ptolemy's work on ancient Asia[13]. Of the few exceptions referred to above are Pithawala's *Historical Geography of Sind*, and Law's *Geography of Early Buddhism*[14]. Among stray articles a large

1. *AB.*, VI, Nos. 344-45; V, No. 418; IV, Nos. 387 and 415.
2. *NIA.*, I, p. 24; IHQ, XVI; p, 380, and p. 486.
3. *AB.*; V, No. 482.
4. *Aspects of Life*; Motichandra, "Indian Costumes etc.", *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, I, pp. 28; p. 6; *JIOSA*, VIII, pp. 62-145; 185-224.
5. *Bull. DCRI*; II, pp. 50-111; 263-299.
6. *Ind. Ant.* LIX, p. 159 and 169.
7. *AB.*; VI, No. 412; VIII, No. 335; VII, No. 413; *NIA.*, II, p. 389; *IHQ.*, XIII, p. 162.
8. *AB*, 1911; *AB.*, VI. Nos. 340 and 351. 402.
9. *AB.*, V. No. 449.
10. *Bull D.C.R.I*, III, pp. 349-391.
11. *Gegraphy of Ancient India.*
12. *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, London, 1927.
13. *AB.*, VIII, No. 426.
14. Also his *Geographical Essays*, I, 1937. London, and Bibliograhpy of Publications relating to ancient Indian Geography. *ABIA.*, X, pp. 12-20.

number discuss the identification of Laṅkā[1]; places mentioned by Ptolemy[2], such as Karours, Palours, Ponnate, Sopatama, Gandaridai; Pundravardhana and other sites in Bengal[3]; Kalinganagara etc. on the Orissan coast[4]. On the western coast identifications have been attempted of Dwarka[5], Trikūṭa, Daṇḍakāraṇya, Carnate etc.[6], whereas a couple of articles relate to the Deccan[7], a few to the Vedic geography[8] and sites and rivers in the Punjab[9]. There is a solitary instance where place-names have been correlated with cultural history[10].

A hundred years ago Ram Raz's 'essay' was the only work dealing with the theoretical aspect of Indian architecture. A little later Kern and others edited the *Bṛhat Saṁhitā*, *Agni*, *Vāyu* and other Purāṇas, all of which dealt incidentally with descriptions of temples and images. Simultaneously with this, Cunningham and his assistants published accounts of Buddhist, and Brahmanic monuments with drawings and photographs of architectural pieces. These were studied by Fergusson. But barring Burgess and after him Cousens no one tried to describe the temple from an Indian point of view using either the classical (Sanskrit) or local terms in usages, primarily because very few works existed with which the archaeological architecture could be compared.

The work after the last war removed this want to a great extent. Acharya edited, translated and illustrated the *Mānasāra*[11] and published a fairly comprehensive dictionary of Indian architecture[12]. Likewise other ancient works on architecture are also published by

1. *AB.*, I, No. 303; V, No. 489; VII, No. 488; XII, No. 403; *NIA.*, I, 463; *ABORI.*, XXI, p. 270.
2. *Ibid.*, IV., No. 420, I, No. 229; XI, No. 463; V, No. 491; VIII, No. 440 respectively.
3. *Ibid.*, IV, No. 425; VIII, No. 444, 439; VII. No. 495.
4. *Ibid.*, IV, Nos. 422, 426, 379; I. No. 301; No. 300; *IHQ.*, XV, p. 475.
5. *JRBS.*, *IHQ.*, XIII, p. 700; *AB.*, VI, No. 461.
6. *AB.*, IV., No. 428; XII., No. 400; XI, No. No. 512; XII, No. 415.
7. *AB.*, V, No. 490., *IHQ.*, XIV., p. 779.
8. *Ibid.*, VIII, Nos. 428, 430.
9. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 366; VII, No. 504; XI, 515.
10. *IHQ*, XV., p. 137.
11. *Indian Architecture*, 1927, 1934.
12. *A Dictionary of Hindu Architecture*, Oxford, 1927; see also Coomaraswami, 'Indian Architectural Terms', *JAOS.*, 48, (1928), p. 250. (*AB.*, III No. 162.)

Bose[1], Ganapatisastri[2] and others[3], a number of scholars have discussed the application of classical terms to existing monuments, or given a theoretical description of town-planning temples, theatres and forts[4]. Among the former the most controversial topics is the significance of the terms Nāgara, Vesara, and Draviḍa[5].

Beginning with Havell, scholars have also tried to interpret[6] Indian architecture, and to lay bare its psychology, ' symbolism ', or ' art and philosophy '.

Archaeological study of architecture has kept apace, most of which is already alluded to wherever it came within a definite dynastic sphere. After Fergusson briefly described the different types of Indian architecture, Jouveau Dubreuil and Foucher studied in great detail the South Indian and Gandhāra architecture respectively. In this quarter Codrington[7], Coomarswamy[8] and a few foreign[9] and Indian scholars[10] have once again approached the subject devoting greater attention to certain periods. Owing to the work of the Archaeological Survey of India and that of various Indian States more material is now available for a regional and dynastic study of monuments in Rajputana, Central India and Central Provinces, Gujarat, Karnatak-Mysore, Hyderabad, South India, Bihar, Bengal and Orissa. A number of publications[11] now exist which give a bird's eye view of Indian architecture.

Indian sculpture and iconography are dependent upon architecture, for they form a part of it. Hence more the dis-

1. *Śilpa Śāstra*, Lahore, 1928.
2. *Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra*, Baroda, 1926.
3. Bose, N. K. *Canons of Orissans Architecture*, Calcutta, 1932. *Kāśyapa Śilpa*, Poona 1926; ' *Hindu Architecture* according to *Tantrasamuccaya*', *JIOSA*.. V. p. 204.
4. *AB*., II, No. 167; VI, No. 181; No. 184; XII, No. 170; I, No. 113-14-15., XI, No. 415.
5. *AB*., VIII, No. 115; XII, No. 155.
6. *AB*., I, No. 102; II, Nos. 151, 155, 196, 219; XI, Nos. 61-62.
7. *Ancient India.*
8. *History of Indian and Indonesian* Art, 1929; and *AB*., IV, No. 64: VI, No. 162.
9. Bately, *The Design development of Indian Architecture*, London 1935; AB., No. 156.
10. Iyer, *Indian Architecture*, Madras, 1929; Gangoly, *AB*., IV, Calcutta, 1928.
11. Hurlimann, *Picturesque India*, Bombay, 1929; Wallace, *Panoramic India*, Bombay, 1931.

-covery of specimens of the latter greater the opportunity for studying the regional development and distribution of images of different cults. Likewise more publications of ancient works on architecture, which incidentally deal with images and at times with iconometry enable us in identification of images and understanding regional changes. Thus has the outlook in iconographical studies been changing since Gopinath Rao wrote his volumes: *Elements of Hindu Iconography*. He had based his work on some published and unpublished canonical literature and illustrated the various types of images from existing monuments without attempting a chronological and regional correlation between them. Now, in addition to the works on architecture mentioned above, are published the *Viṣṇudharmottara*[1], *Pratimālakṣaṇam*[2], *Devatāmūrti-prakaraṇam* and *Rūpamaṇḍanam*[3], *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇam*[4], *Brahmayāmala-tantra*[5], *Vāstusāra-prakaraṇam*[6] etc.

The ground for a scientific study of iconography is thus prepared. The studies however have so far, except in a few cases,[7] not proceeded on the desired lines. No doubt there have been numerous articles on the subject and its sub-branches. But they all deal with stray, unrelated images. Hence only the most important contributions are here indicated.

Images of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma,[8] believed to be of the Kushāna period, are reported from the U. P. and rare images of the 24 forms of Viṣṇu from Gujarat,[9] Viṣṇu's ten incarnations from Bengal;[10] uncommon types of 5 faced composite Viṣṇu, usualey identified as Pañcamukhi Hanumān.[11] Discussion has also centered round the

1. Calcutta University.
2. Calcutta University, 1932.
3. Calcutta, 1936.
4. Lahore, 1929; *AB.*, VII, No. 182.
5. *AB.*, No. 225.
6. Ajmer,
7. When the Ms. was being sent to the Press the writer saw a review of Jitendra Nath Banerjee's *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, Calcutta, 1941. from which it appears that the book, though not a regional study, is at least a study of the historical development of the subject.
8. *AB.*, III. No. 192; XII, No. 216 respectively; cf. also III, No. 191.
9. *Journal af the Bombay University*, VII, 4 pp. 1-6. *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 524.
10. IHQ., XVII, p. 370; *AB.*, IV, No. 225. (It has been pointed out that this may be a Tāntric Buddhist image).
11. *AB.*, III, No. 191; *NIA.*, II, p. 113.

Mother and Child images,[1] the evolution of the image of Śrī or Lakṣmī[2] and the Varāha *avatāra*[3] and the cult of the Śalagrāma.[4]

The identification of a few seal-figures from Mohenjo-daro as proto-types of Śiva, and other objects as Śaiva symbols has raised new problems with regard to the antiquity of the Śaiva cult and Siva image. More of such regional and literary studies as the *Origin of Śaivism* and *its History* in *the Tamil Land*,[5] *Rudra-Śiva*[6] would be welcome. For it is the correlation of these individual studies with similar archaeological studies that will very likely lead to some definite results. On similar lines are the attempts to study the history of phallicism in India,[7] 'Sadāśiva worship and the Śākta cult in Early Bengal'[8] and the representation of Śiva on early Indian coins.[9] Whereas a number of articles deal with later Śaiva images of stone and bronze, the discovery of *eka-mukha-liṅgas* of the Gupta period from Central India and Mathura,[10] and of a unique gigantic Śivaite sculpture from Parel (Bombay)[11] are important for the history of Saiva iconography. Subsidiary deities of the Śaiva pantheon-Kārttikeya,[12] Gaṇeśa[13], Kṣetrapāla[14], Piśāca[15], as well as the emblems or weapons[16] held by these deities have also received attention. Among these Getty's monograph on Gaṇeśa, though not strictly on historical lines, deserves notice.

Early and rare types of Sūrya images are found from Afghanistan[17] and Bengal[18] and Kathiawar[19] respectively.

1. Ibid., VIII, No. 208. No. 269.
2. Hartmann, *Geschichte der Gotten Laksmi*, Leipzig, 1933, (AB., VIII, No. 216); and V, No. 249; X, Nos. 242, 250.
3. AB., IX, No. 230.
4. AB., X, No. 88.
5. Subrahmaniyan, Madras, 1929.
6. Venkataramana, Madras, 1941.
7. *AB.*, X, No. 54.
8. *AB.*, IX, No. 228;
9. *AB.*, X, No. 233; *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 118.
10. *AB.*, *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 489.No. 151.
11. *AB.*, VI, Nos. 221; VIII, No. 225.
12. *AB.*, I, No. 131; No. 255.
13. *Ibid.*, III, No. 161 ; IX, Nos. 222; 228; *JISOA*, VIII, pp. 41-55. *JIH.*, XVIII, pp. 188-194.
14. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 209.
15. *Bull., DCRI.*, Vol. II, p. 220.
16. *AB.*, III, No. 177; VII, No. 247; *IHQ.*, XIII, p. 717 ; XV, p. 129.
17. *AB.*, XII, No. 594.
18. *AB.*, VIII, Nos. 210, 222, 246.
19. *JBU.*, VI, iv, pp. 56-7.

Of the rest of the miscellaneous articles mention should be made of studies of Agni,[1] Yama,[2] Brahmā,[3] Dhanvantari,[4] Lokapālas,[5] Yakṣas,[6] folk goddesses,[7] Gaṅgā-Yamunā[8] and symbolism in iconography[9] and sculpture.[10]

Early Indian archaeology, if not wholly, was mainly Buddhist. Bharhut, Sanchi, Amaravati, Mathura, Gandhara and later the excavations at Taxila and Nalanda had yielded rich and spectacular finds, with the result that Buddhist art-architecture, sculpture and iconography had already attracted many a foreign scholar before 1918. In the last 25 years archaeological explorations in India and outside-Afganistan, Chinese and Russian Turkestan on the one hand, and Ceylon and the Malay Archipelago on the other-have not only added immense material but raised new problems for study.

Bhattacharyya[11] did for Buddhist iconography and on a much more exhaustive scale what Gopinath Rao had done for Hindu Iconography. Before him Foucher and Grünwedel had written on the subject, but their treatment was not exhaustive, nor did they deal with the later development in Buddhist iconography caused by Tantric influences. Bhattacharyya ransacked the Tantric texts (*Sādhanas*), edited[12] and analysed them and correlated the material with archaeological specimens wherever it was possible to do so. Bhattasali[13] followed him. Since then a number of articles and small monographs have been published on the early and late iconography of Buddhism. Among the former mention should be made of the works of Foucher[14] and Coomarswamy[15] where an attempt is

---

1. *AB.*, V, No. 250; IX, 234; X, Nos. 173, 229.
2. *NIA.*, II, p. 282.
3. *AB.*, XII, p. 225.
4. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 257.
5. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 255,
6. III, No. 226; VI, No. 220.
7. *Ibid.*, No. 230; *IHQ.*, XIV, p. 101; and p. XV, p. 523;
8. *Ibid.*, X, No. 251.
9. *Ibid.*, XI, No. 277; III, No. 233; VI, 229; VII, No. 253; VIII, No. 226.
10. *Ibid.*, III, No. 242; XII, No. 215; No. 249.
11. *The Indian Buddhist Iconography.* 1924.
12. *Sādhanamāla*, Vol. I, and II, Baroda, 1925 and 1928.
13. *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, Dacca, 1929.
14. *On the Iconography of Buddha's Nativity*, 1935.
15. *Elements of Buddhist Iconography*, 1935.

made to interpret the subject from metaphysical points of view. Individual features of this early phase, more properly known as the signs of the *mahāpuruṣa*, such as Buddha's *cūḍā* and *uṣṇīṣa*, have been minutely studied by scholars.[1] Longhurst, Combaz and others[2] have discussed the symbolism and evolution of the *Stūpa*.

Articles on the later Buddhist iconography relate to Tārā, and to some uncommon Tantric gods and goddesses.[3]

Connected with this subject is the origin of the Buddha image. Coomaraswamy,[4] Ganguly[5] and others[6] hold that it originated in India, owing to certain religious developments, whereas Scherman,[7] Longhurst and others (recently Tarn[8]) ascribe its origin in Gandhāra to Indo-Greek influences.

A third view of Heras[9] derives the Gandhāra art itself from indigenous sources, thus implying the Indian origin of the Buddha image also.

Indian art—Buddhist and other sculpture—has been widely studied by foreign scholars, among whom reference may be made to the works of Bachhofer,[10] Diez,[11] Doehring,[12] Fischer,[13] Kramrisch,[14] Wallschmidt,[15] Hackin,[16] Havell,[17] Codrington,[18] and Vogel.[19]

---

1. *AB.*, III, No. 229; VI, Nos. 214, 217, 227; X, No. 244; XI, No. 258; IV, No. 222; V, No. 239; VI, Nos. 215, 218; III, No. 241; VII, No. 250; X, No. 245, XI, No. 263, XII, No. 213.

2. *AB.*, XI, No. 190; XII, Nos. 149-150; I, No. 101; II, No. 156; III, No. 153, 186; V, No. 196; VI, Nos. 178, 183; VIII, Nos. 152, 154, 162; X, Nos. 164, 182, XI, No. 182; *IHQ.*, XIV, pp. 1-56; ;. 440; XVII, p. 123.

3. *Ibid.*, I, No. 165; III, No.222; IV, Nos. 179, 196; *IHQ.*, XV, p. 278 and *Bull. DCRI*, I, pp. 45-59.

4. *Ibid.*, I, No. 140; II, No. 202;

5. *OAZ.*

6. *AB.*, IX, No. 221.

7. *AB.*, III, No. 238; IV, No. 176.

8. *AB.*, No. 592. *The Greeks in India.*

9. 'Origin of the socalled Greeco-Buddhist School of Sculpture of Gandhāra.' *IUB.*, *AB.*, XII, No. 156.

10. *Early Indian Sculpture.*

11. *Die Kunst Indiens*, 1926.

12. *Indische Kunst*, 1925.

13. *Die Kunst Indiens*, 1928.

14. *Die Indische Kunst.*

15. *Buddhistische Kunst Indiens*, Berlin, 1932.

16. *AB.*, XII, No. 592.

17. *Indian Sculpture* and *Painting*, London, 1928.

18. *Indian Sculpture.*

19. *De Buddhistich Kunst*, Amsterdum, 1932; and *La Sculpture de Mathura*, 1930.

Besides these monographs there are a number of articles on Gandhāra[1], Bodhgaya[2], Mathura[3], Bharhut[4], Sanchi[5], Andhra[6], (Amarāvati, Jagayapetta and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa), Early Bengal[7], Pāla[8] and other[9] sculptures.

The spread of Buddhism beyond the frontiers of India in the North has been further confirmed by the explorations of Hackin, Wright and others in Afghanistan, in the Swat valley and Central Asia (Chinese and Soviet Turkestan); its strength in Central India, the Deccan and the Andhra country by the discovery of the Buddhist caves at Bāgh and Aurangabad and the excavations at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and the finds of Buddhist sculptures near Goli village (Guntur District); its affinity with Java by the discovery of numerous bronzes at Nālandā, Kurkihar and other places in Bihar; its preservation in Nepal and Tibet by the collection of bronzes, manuscripts and painting from these countries.

Naturally new vistas of studies have been opened up by these discoveries. Hackin[10] and others have pointed out the influence of the colossal Buddhas at Bamiyan on Buddhist sculpture elsewhere. The diseovery of Andhra sculptures from Ceylon would stimulate the further exploration in that country ; whereas the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa sculptures have provided immense material for a study of the material culture of the period and the Jātaka stories portrayed therein. The relation between the Nālandā and Java art has been discussed by Kempers and others, whereas the varied data from Nepal and Tibet perticularly the Mss. enable scholars to reconstruct many a lost Buddhist text.

The progress in Jaina studies, considering the antiquity of the religion, its vitality, and the preservation of its Mss. literature in Jaina Bhandaras, may be said to be negligible. The scholars and

1. *AB.*, II, No. 205; III, Nos. 178, 201; V, Nos. 175, 187, 244; VII, No. 196 ; IX, No. 177; VIII, No. 133; IX, Nos. 217, 219; XII, No. 156, 211 a; X, No. 132; X, Nos. 267, 253.
2. *Ibid.*, XII, Nos. 142, 151, *Ind. Cul.*, IV, p. 97.
3. *Ibid.*, VII, Nos. 93, 245; XII, 210 a.
4. *Ibid.*, II, No. 129; X, No. 239.
5. *Ibid.*, VII, 191.
6. *Ibid.*, III, Nos. 106, 227; IV, No. 160-61; VI, No. 225; VII, No. 249; X, Nos. 226; XI, No. 264.
7. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 175, (*JDL.*, Calcutta University, XXX, pp. 1-85).
8. *Ibid.*, VIII, No. 148; XII, No. 159, No. 131.
9. *Ibid.*, III, No. 92; VIII, No. 611; IX, No. 757; IX, No. 167; *NIA.*, I, p. 544.
10. *AB*, III, No. 628; XII, No. 592.

their works in its different aspects can be easily recounted. Omitting the number of Jaina texts published in various *granthāvalis* we have from Winternitz[1] and Desai[2], a fair idea of the history of the Jaina literature; from Glasenapp[3] and Guerinot[4] of the Jaina religion; its traditional chronology from S. Shah[5] and historical development in North India and Karnatak from C. G. Shah[6], Saletore[7] and Sarma[8] respectively.

Jaina archæology is still in its infancy. For a long time Smith's *Jaina Stupa at Mathura* was the only work on the subject, whereas in the South Jainism was represented by the colossal stature at Śravaṇa Belgola. Now Nahar[9] has brought together all the Jaina inscriptions; a few articles have appeared announcing the discovery of the Jaina monuments from different parts of India–Gujarat[10], Kathiawar[11], Marwar[12], Bengal[13], South India (Pudukotah State)[14] or of different periods[15]; and attempts are made to write on its iconography[16], while considerable attention has been paid to miniature paintings on mediaeval Jaina manuscripts[17].

There has been remarkable progress in the discovery and study of Indian paintings of all periods. Whereas formerly Ajanta represented the ancient period, and Rajput and Mughal the mediaeval period, we now have a few more traces of the prehistoric and

1. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II.
2. *History of Jaina Literature* (in Gujarati).
3. *Der Jainismus*, Berlin, 1926.
4. *La Religion Djaina*, Paris, 1926.
5. *The Traditional Chronology of the Jains*, 1935.
6. *Jainism in Northern India*, 1932.
7. *Mediaeval Jainism.*
8. *Jainism and Karnataka Culture*, Dharwar, 1940.
9. *Jain Inscriptions.*
10. Nawab, *Jain satya Prakash.* (in Gujarāti:) V, pp. 203; VII, p. 211-223; and Sankalia, *Bull. D. C. R. I.* I, p. 185 ff.
11. *JRAS.*, 1938, p. 426; and XII, No. 272.
12. *AB.*, XII, No. 221.
13. *Ind. Cul.*, VI, pp. 137–40.
14. *Ibid.*, IX, No. 216.
15. *Ibid.*, II, No. 212; IV, No. 169; No. 235; XII, No. 161.
16. *AB.*, II, No. 208; III, No. 159; X, No. 240; VI, No. 149; VIII, No. 218; IX, No. 227; and Bhattacharya, *Jaina Iconography*, Lahore, 1941; Sankalia, "Jaina Iconography," *NIA*, II, p. 497 ff., *Jaina Antiquary*, IV, p. 85; V, p. 49; *IHQ.*, XVI, p. 314. Shah, *JUB.*, IX, ii, pp. 147-169; X, p. 195.
17. Brown, *AB.*, IV, No. 189; VIII, No. 179; IX, No. 193; XII, No. 186, Mehata, *AB.*, IV, No. 208; Coomaraswamy, X, Nos. 194, 195. Nawab, *Jaina-citrakalpadruma*, (in Gujarati), Ahmadabad, 1935.

ancient, from different parts of India, while the miniature paintings in early Mss. from Gujarat, Bengal and Tibet, and wall paintings from Turkestan have revealed the so-called schools of paintings in these regions in the early mediaeval period. This wide distribution of paintings in nooks and corners of India implied a systematic cultivation of the art in the country[1]. This has been attested to by *Viṣṇudharmottara*[2], and numerous references to the art in Indian literature[3] of all kinds[4].

Rock-paintings, supposed to be of the prehistoric period, have been found at Mahadeo hills[5] in the Central Provinces and recently in Sind[6].

Hitherto the earliest historical paintings came to light from the Vaiṣṇava Cave III at Bādāmi[7], whereas the extension of the Ajanta art was traced in the caves at Ellora[8] and Aurangabad. in the late Pallava[9] and early Cola temples at Kanchi and Sittanvasel[10] respectively. The art survived in South India till late, for its manifestation is found in the Vijayanagara temples at Lepakshi,[11] in the Bṛhadīsvara temple at Tanjore,[12] and in the Palace and temple in Cochin[13] and Trichur respectively.

Existence of a mediæval Gujarat School of painting is postulated on the strength of a number of miniature paintings on Jaina[14], Vaiṣṇava[15] and Śaiva[16] and other secular Manuscripts[17].

More evidence has been gathered for similar school of miniature painting which flourished in Eastern India[18]. Its spread to Tibet

1. Cf. Stchoukine, *RAA.*, IV, pp. 146-152 (*AB.*, II, No. 194.)
2. Stella Kramrisch: Calcutta, 1924, *AB.*, I, No. 149, and VII, No. 215.
3. Coomaraswamy, *AB.*, V, 213; VI, No. 196; VII, No. 212; VIII, Nos. 182-183.
4. From Kālidāsa, Bāna and others, Sivaramamurti, *AB.*, VIII, Nos. 202, 203, 204, Raghvan, *AB.*, VIII, No. 201.
5. *AB.*, XI, No. 227.
6. *JRASB.*, VII, 1941, No. 2, pp. 197-202.
7. *AB.*, XI, No. 231.
8. *AB.*, I, Nos. 139, 158; VI, No. 211; VII, No. 210.
9. *AB.*, VI, Nos. 192, 203; XII, No. 206a.
10. *Ibid.*, VII, Nos. 227-228; X, No. 190; XII, No. 203.
11. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 206.
12. *Ibid.*, XII, Nos. 203, 204.
13. *Ibid.*, Nos. X, 189; XI, Nos. 216, 217, 218.
14. *AB.*, VI, Nos. 215-216; VIII, No. 79; IX, No. 192.
15. *AB.*, V, Nos. 209, 218, 222; XI, No. 233.
16. Majumdar, *NIA.*, II, pp. 311-16; Sastri, *IHQ.*, XIV, pp. 425-431.
17. *AB.*, VI, No. 201.
18. *Ibid.*, I, No. 157; VIII, No. 186.

has been proved by the discovery of Indian paintings in Western Tibetan temples by Tucci[1] and others

While new discoveries are being made, the old material—the frescoes at Ajanta—is being scientifically preserved and copied[2]. Scholars have also undertaken general survey[3] of the art as well as investigations of its technical[4] and cultural aspects[5].

Two facts emerge from this survey. The first is that political history has received greater attention from scholars than the cultural. Comparatively little has been done in subjects like historical geography or ethnology, regional study of cults and iconography or material culture as illustrated by sculptures and paintings. This tendency to lay stress on chronology is inevitable, as it is the foundation of historical knowledge. However much light can be thrown on Indian Culture in general if other aspects are simultaneously attended to. Inscriptions, which constitute a major source for ancient historical studies and which hitherto have been studied mainly from dynastic points of view, can be utilized more exhaustively. The names of Brāhmaṇa and other donees mentioned therein, if studied geo-chronologically and correlated with present day Brāhmaṇa (or other) names and gotras, will contribute to our knowledge of historical ethnology. The identification of inscriptional place names, and similar names occurring in the literature of the period corresponding to the region, will not only form the bases for a corpus on ancient geography of India, and help to understand the territorial divisions of the region for administrative purposes, but a correlation of the ancient names with the modern will also explain the linguistic changes. If, further, certain names occur continuously in a number of dynastic periods they will explain the linguistic evolution as well as the historical importance of the places. Such repeated references to a place or places will also supply clues for archaeological exploration.

1. *Ibid.*, XII, No. 207; XII, No. 617-18; Roerich, *AB.*, II, No. 191.

2. 'The Colour and Monocrome reproductions of the Ajanta frescoes based on photography.' Part I, II, Landon, 1930.

3. Mehta, *Studies in Indian Painting*; *AB.*, I, No. 153; Ghosh, 'A Comparative Survey of Indian Painting'; *AB.*, I, No. 144; 'The Development of Jaina Painting', *AB.*, II, No. 184; Kramrisch, *A Survey of Painting in the Deccan*, London, 1937.

4. *AB.*, XII, Nos. 202, 204.

5. *Ibid.*, II, No. 186; VII, No. 221; VIII, No. 180; XII, Nos. 187, 197, 199; *ABORI.*, XII, p. 24.

The second fact that would strike one is that there has not been sufficient field work. Hitherto archaeological exploration was done by the Archaeological Survey of India and recently it has been taken up by a few Indian States, like Baroda, Mysore, Hyderabad, Travancore and Jaipur. Universities, Museums and research societies have hardly played any part in it. If the reason for this is partly attributable to Government aloofness, the Universities and such other bodies also cannot escape the blame for their apathy. Until recently they have never encouraged field work. This is necessary not only for all periods of archaeology-prehistoric, protohistoric, historic—but also such subjects as historical geography and ethnology. As suggested before a systematic study of the latter might yield clues for archaeological exploration. And none except universities, museums and research institutes can take up such work for want of facilities-survey maps—etc. These institutions must come forward and cooperate with Government and the States—and both these should reciprocate—in a coordinated scheme of research. For culture knew and knows no political frontiers.[1]

1. As mentioned above some of the footnotes had remained incomplete when the article was first sent to the Editor, owing to the disruption of the Library facilities. The writer hoped to fill them in in the proof-stage. But at the time when the proofs were received, he was away on field-work, and the proofs had to be returned soon. So these foot-notes, it is regretted, have remained uncompleted even in the final stage.

PROGRESS OF SOUTH INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND EPIGRAPHY DURING THE PAST 25 YEARS

By

R. S. PANCHAMUKHI

I Introduction.

II Prehistoric and proto-historic archæology, exploration and excavation.

III Epigraphy.

IV Archæological research in the Native States.

V Museum

(i) Study of art and architecture.

(ii) Paintings.

VI Publications.

VII Important bibliography.

The record of work accomplished by the Archæological Departments of the Government of India, and Native States of Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore and Pudukottai in South India and the Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar (Bombay Karnatak), during the years 1917-1942 is of varied nature and magnitude. Before reviewing the contribution made by the several bodies in the various branches of Archæology, namely exploration and excavation of prehistoric and ancient sites, epigraphy, iconography, art and architecture, numismatics and the reconstruction of the political history of South India, it is worth while surveying the state of archæological studies at the beginning of this period. The highest antiquity to which the archæological researches could be referred, prior to 1917, did not go beyond the *nirvāṇa* of Buddha (6th century B. C.) and the discovery and decipherment of the Aśokan edicts belonging to the 3rd century B. C. were considered to be the greatest achievements of an antiquarian. The ancient Buddhist sites and monuments which had been surveyed previously by General Cunningham and his assistants in North India were selected for detailed exploration and excavation by the newly constituted

Archæological Survey of India under the direction of Sir John Marshall. Excavation work was done at Rajgir, Sahet Mahet, Kasia, Sarnath, Merpur, Khas, Peshawar and other places and the material illustrative of the life of the people, who lived in these cities centuries ago, was recovered and made a subject of detailed study. The attention of the department and individual scholars was concentrated on the clarification of the political and cultural history of North India and parts of South India where the Aśokan edicts had been discovered and ancient Buddhist sites had been dug out. It is true that Bruce Foote had, in his momentous volumes on Indian Prehistorics, surveyed and spotted palæolithic, neolithic and early iron age sites in the whole of India and made surface collections to illustrate the different cultural strata in the North as well as South India. He had also, by a study of the flints, stone implements, pottery pieces and other relics unearthed at the sites, attempted to fix up the sequence and chronology of different cultures. But his conclusions had to remain vague on account of lack of a deciding piece of evidence to correlate them with the mass of prehistoric antiquities unearthed in Mesopotamia, Greece, Italy, Crete etc. whose age had been determined. The startling discoveries of buried cities of different cultural strata belonging to the prehistoric period, at Mohenjo-Daro in the year 1924, at one stroke carried back the antiquity of Indian archæology not by centuries, but by several millenia before the birth of Christ and opened a new field for antiquarian researches. Correlation of the finds at these places with the results of Bruce Foote's researches in terms of palæolithic, neolithic and iron age cultures was attempted and the character and age of the several strata were fixed up. Thus, we may note with a sense of satisfaction the vast change which Indian Archæology has brought about in Indian researches during the years subsequent to 1917 and the reflection it has left on the activity of world archæology in general.

As far as South India is concerned, pioneers like Fleet, Bhandarkar, Hultzsch, Venkayya, Krishnasastri, Kielhorn, Burgess and Rice had set themselves to the study of the lithic and copper-plate inscriptions to make out the political history of the main dynasties that ruled in Karnatak, Tamil and Telugu countries from the beginning of the Christian era. Fleet's dynasties of the Kanarese Districts based chiefly on the Sanskrit, Prakrit and old Kannada inscriptions published by him in the volumes of the Indian Antiquary, the Epigraphia Indica and the Journal of

the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society etc., Bhandarkar's History of the Dekkan, Hultzsch's and Venkayya's reports on South Indian Epigraphy which contained sketches of the royal families that held sway in the Tamil country, Krishnasastri's scholarly papers in the Archæological Survey Reports on the Viceroys of the Vijayanagara kings, Kielhorn's Lists of South Indian Inscriptions arranged according to the dynasties and chronology with synchronistic tables and dynastic lists of kings, and Burgess's Reports on the survey of monuments in Western India and Karnatak, furnished clear and strong foundations for the progress of researches in the several branches of archæology. Fergusson's Volumes on Indian Architecture, Sewell's Lists of antiquities in the Madras Presidency, Parts I & II, and Cousin's Archaeological Remains in the Bombay Presidency as well as Elliot's South Indian Coinage had laid the study of ancient monuments, art and architecture and numismatics on scientific lines. But the exploration and excavation of prehistoric sites in the Dekkan and South India had not received the attention which they merited from the Department except a stray digging at Ādichchanallūr, which had yielded iron age finds of much archæological and anthropological interest, and a survey and notice of a few dolmens and cairns in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies.

This unequal treatment of North and South India in respect of certain fields of research is perhaps attributable to the divided responsibility of the provincial and central Governments which they shared in the execution of their respective works without coordination. This defect was removed by placing archaeology under the sole charge of the Central Government after the inauguration of the Reforms of 1919. The Epigraphical Department was entirely reorganised and from the year 1921-22, the Archaeological Department began to issue its reports in a consolidated form instead of each Circle issuing a separate publication. Inspite of this welcome change, the Director General of Archaeology in India whose headquarters remained at Delhi had heavy preoccupations in Sind and the Punjab and consequently rarely crossed the Vindhyas to South India until perhaps the discovery of the Erragudi rock edicts of Aśoka in 1926 which brought him occasionally to a few places in South India. But it was not till Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M. A., F. R. A. S. B., was appointed the Director General of Archaeology that the hidden treasures of South India began to be tapped, assorted and studied systematically for a connected account of the cultural

history of South India and our thanks are due to the versatile genius of that great talented head of the Archaeological Department for his incessant endeavours to save the rich archaeological resources of our land from the havocks of time and ignorant vandals.

I shall briefly relate the discoveries made in the several branches of Archaeology in South India and review the progress made in the respective lines since 1917 from which year our survey commences.

II. Exploration and Excavation of Sites

I divide this subject into prehistoric and proto-historic poriods and the former roughly into the Stone Age and the Age of Metals. In the Stone Age, again, four successive phases may be distinguished: Eolithic or the Dawn of the Stone Age, Palaeolithic or the Old Stone Age, Mesolithic or the Transitional Age, and Neolithic or the Polished or the New Stone Age. Each age shows some marked progress in the preparation of stone implements. In Palaeolithic times, tools were shaped by chipping hard flints, while in the Neolithic times they were made by grinding and polishing. A long period of time intervened between the Old and the New Stone Ages of India as was demonstrated by Bruce Foote in a section of the right bank of the Sābaramatī river in Gujarat where a deposit between the Neolithic and Palaeolithic finds measured more than 200 ft. in depth. In Europe, the Mesolithic Age intervened between the two while in India nothing is known of the Mesolithic industries to bridge the gulf between the two ages. The Stone Age passed into the Age of Metals which shows two successive phases, viz., the Copper Age and the Iron Age. While in most parts of Europe, the Stone Age gave place to the Bronze Age, in Northern India the Copper Age succeeded the former. The culture represented by Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa is assigned to the Chaliolithic Age, i. e., the age of copper and stone which lay midway between the Stone Age and the Iron Age. In Southern India, however, the Iron Age was a direct descendant of the Stone Age. In one or two solitary cases-at Maski and Chandravalli, however, isolated copper implements are reported to have been found in association with microlithic finds of the Stone Age. If copper is found in large quantities in a sufficiently large number of Stone Age sites, we may perhaps be forced to accept the intervention of Copper between Stone and Iron Ages in Southern India also.

Though it is not conclusively established, we may assign approximate periods to the prevalence of the above-mentioned phases of culture in prehistoric India. It is enough to indicate that Iron Age culture flourished between 1000 B.C. and 500 B.C. which is usually accepted by the scholars.

With this preliminary knowledge about the character and age of Indian prehistoric finds, it may be noted that not many sites of the prehistoric periods have been explored in South India, though the country is known to abound in such, from the folklore, tradition and local chronicles and above all from the topography of the mounds and debris of different cultural layers, scattered over the land. The most extensive site of the Iron age discovered so far is that of Ādichchanallūr where excavations revealed a number of pits in quartz rock to contain burial urns which, in a few cases, showed complete bones of a human skeleton. The objects found in association with the bones included red and black pottery vessels, gold and bronze articles, iron celts, swords, daggers and implements and cornelian beads. Perungulam in the Malbar District, Perumbair in the Chinglepeth District, Kaniyampundi and Sirumugi in the Coimbatore District and Gajjalkonda in the Kurnool District are some of the Iron Age sites discovered so far in the Madras Presidency. They exhibit stone circles and cairns containing tombs with bones, pottery vessels, iron implements and shell ornaments. But since 1917 onwards, no site worth a notice has been discovered and excavated in South India except perhaps at Nungambakkam and Mylapore in Madras where a trial excavation laid bare pottery and huge vessels with deposits of bones and pieces of iron.

In recent years several important sites of the Palaeolithic and early Iron Ages have been explored in South India. Mr. G. Yazdani, O. B. E., in Hyderabad, Dr. M. H. Krishna in Mysore, Rao Bahadur C. R. Krishnamacharlu in Madras and the present writer in the Bombay Karnatak have conducted original researches in their respective areas and as a result of their continued explorations and trial excavations, they have been able to discover a number of early Iron Age sites.

In Mysore and Hyderabad, several sites of the early Iron Age culture have been spotted. Col. Meadows Taylor, Rev. G. Keis and R. Bruce Foote of the Geological Survey of the Government of India as well as the late Captain Leonard Munn, Special Officer, Hyderabad Geological Survey have noticed prehistoric and proto-historic

sites in the Nizams Dominions. Megalithic tombs in a great variety of forms occur in the Raichur District of Hyderabad. In the cairn burials at Raigir two kinds of pottery were found : a red polished ware and a black polished one with a red base. The number of prehistoric settlements such as Maski, Beṇkal, Mudgal, Gorebāḷ etc., explored so far exceeds twenty-four in the Raichur District alone of the Hyderabad State. Large scale excavations were undertaken at Maski as a result of which black and red funeral pottery, polished stone implements and chert flakes belonging to 1000 B. C., or earlier, were unearthed. In Mysore, Chandravalli is the only site where excavation was started by Dr. M. H. Krishna on a scientific basis in the year 1929-30 but the operations have not yet been complete and the results of the excavations so far conducted have not been furnished to scholars. The preliminary note on the excavations shows the importance of the site and its antiquity ranging from the Andhra period to the Neolithic times or at least the early Iron Age.

Though South India and Dekkan are teeming with prehistoric sites of Palæolithic, Neolithic and Early Iron Age cultures, no large scale and exhaustive excavations have been done at any of the places to enable the excavator to formulate his conclusions in the type, character and the significance of the finds for the cultural history of the land. The relics have been, under the circumstances, classified only typologically and not stratifically.

The Bombay Karnatak had been entirely neglected for original exploration and excavation work of an antiquarian nature, The State Departments of Archæology were occupied with the work in their own Provinces and the Archæological Department of the Government of India had solely applied its resources in the excavations of North Indian sites particularly at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa. Thanks to the Government of Bombay the Kannada Research Institute was inaugurated at Dharwar in 1939 with the present writer as its Director. During the short span of two years the rich area of the Bombay Karnatak has yielded to the exploration conducted by the present writer, a number of prehistoric sites assignable to the Iron Age. The most important of these are Herakal and Anagawadi near Bagalkot, Siddapur (in Bilgi Petha), Chimmalgi in the Bagewadi Taluka of the Bijapur District, where red pointed polished pottery, large sized bricks, conch shells and shell ornaments, and iron slags are unearthed in plenty. Again, at Madhavapur-Vadgaon near Belgaum and Itgi on the banks of the

Tuṅgabhadrā in Shirahatti Taluka of the Sangli State similar pottery and bricks etc., are discovered which belong to the same phase of prehistoric culture as the above. These sites deserve to be tapped and excavated on a scientific basis. The finds so far recovered are valuable in connecting Bombay Karnatak with the Mysore and Hyderabad Karnatak areas as well as with Bellary, Anantapur and Kurnool districts of the Madras Presidency with a common cultural bond from the hoary antiquity of the pre-Mauryan age, i. e., roughly from about 1000 B. C.

Of the sites assignable to the historic period, several new ones have been explored during the period of this quarter of a century. Agadi, Lakshmesvar, Banavasi, Pattadkal and Jamkhandi etc., in the Bombay Karnatak where relics of the Andhra, early Kadamba and Chalukyan periods are traced, Chitaldroog, Talkad and Halebid in Mysore, Maski and Kondapur an early Sātavāhana site, in Hyderabad and Sātānikoṭa in the Madras Presidency are some of the fresh sites which are expected to yield important finds for the history of South India. The large variety of terra cotta figures, seals and sealings excavated at Kondapur by the Hyderbad Archæological Department last year testifies to the value of large scale excavations for the understanding of the cultural history of the Dekkan and South India. It is high time that Archæological Departments under different administrations worked with mutual coordination and collaboration so that the results of their investigations might be studied by mutual consultation.

III. Epigraphy

In the studies of Indian Epigraphy which constitutes the most important branch of archaeology supplying as it does the best foundation of history and chronology, wonderful progress has been made in the course of the twenty-five years under review. Particularly, in South India, the researches in Dravidian Epigraphy have been conducted with such special zeal and scientific accuracy that our knowledge of the evolution of the South Indian alphabet has been laid on a sound basis and the details of the dynastic history of the country have been settled with precision and exactitude. Owing to the discoveries of important epigraphs during the last quarter of a century, various missing links have been supplied, wrong theories exploded, fresh unknown families of kings brought to light and many interesting details about the dispensation of civil and criminal justice, powers and functions of the administrative bodies, the

importance of the Mediæval South Indian temple as a centre of spiritual culture and learning, the condition of trade and commerce as well as the influence of social organisations etc., are added to the existing stock of our knowledge. A few noteworthy points which will bear out the vast advance made in this branch of study during the period under review are briefly narrated below.

At the beginning of 1917, no connected account of the political history of South Indian families of kings had been outlined in precision. Their chronology had not been fixed. The researches of Dr. Fleet in Karnatak Epigraphy and of Hultzsch, Venkayya and Sewell in South Indian Dynasties had no doubt begun the fixing up of the salient land marks in the dynastic history of the country. But with the discovery and publication of the Sinnamannur, Veḷvikuḍi and the large Leyden grants, the Pāṇḍya chronology and history have been cleared up with sufficient particulars. In 1916–17, a Brāhmī inscription of the 1st century B. C. was noticed in the Buddhist cave at Guntapalle in the Kistna district while in the same year a long pillar inscription of the Kākatīya queen Rudra Mahādevī was discovered at Mālkāpuram in the Guntur district. The inscription gives very interesting details about the philanthropic activities of her teacher the great Śaiva Rājaguru Viśveśvara Śambhu of Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍha (South-west Bengal), of which the most noteworthy is the establishment of and provision for the maintenance of a Maternity Home (*prasūtyārogya-śālā*). During the next two years (1917–19), much new light was thrown on the administration and management of South Indian temples from the epigraphs examined in the Tamil districts. A few sets of Eastern Gaṅga copperplates secured in 1918 furnished important data for fixing the starting point of the Eastern Gaṅga era in about A. D. 495–96, which is still a subject of much speculation among scholars. 1920 saw the discovery of a number of copperplate records of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin kings, which initiated the discussion regarding their genealogy and chronology. The Polombaru grant of Mādhavavarman-Janāśvarāya Mahārāja furnishes a few valuable synchronisms which determine the date of the plates as 621 A. D., and the conquest of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin territory by the Calukya king Pulikeśin II between A. D. 621 and 631 the date of the Kopparam plates.

In 1921–22, a new family of kings called the Nalas was brought to light by the discovery of the only lithic record of about the 5th century A. D., at Podagadh in the Jaypore Agency (Vizagapatam

District) which is valuable in locating their territory near the East coast. The Rithapuram plates of the Nala king Bhavattavarman were also discovered in the same year. The conquest of the Nalas by Pulikeśin II recorded in the Aihole inscription may perhaps refer to Nalas mentioned here.

The year 1923-24 brought to light a Brāhmī inscription of about the 2nd century A. D., at Allūru in the Kistna district. This proves the existence of a new Buddhist settlement in the Kṛṣṇā-valley where a Buddhist *stūpa* was discovered at Rāmireḍḍipalle.

The examination and study of the newly discovered sets of copperplates of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārājas Skandavarman and Nandivarman in 1924-25 have helped to settle the genealogy and chronology of the Śālaṅkāyana family which ruled at Deṇḍalur, prior to the Viṣṇukuṇḍins, in the 5th century A. D. The greatest event in the South Indian Archaeology was the discovery of the great *stūpa* at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa in the Guntur District and a systematic excavation conducted by Mr. A. H. Longhurst during the years 1926-30, of a number of *stūpas*, *caityas*, monasteries, bas-reliefs and inscriptions which throw a flood of light on the history and art of the period 2nd-3rd century A. D., in the Kṛṣṇā-valley.

The year 1925-26 inaugurated the epigraphical survey of the Bombay Karnatak which is being conducted regularly by the Epigraphical Department. From 1939-40 the work is being shared by the Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, in collaboration with the Superintendent for Epigraphy. As a result of the combined efforts of the two offices, substantial progress is expected to be achieved by accelerating the speed of exploration and collection of inscriptions and other historical material. As a result of this exhaustive village-wise survey much new information has been gathered on the political history of the Bombay Karnatak. Several new kings and dynasties have been discovered and the missing links between one power and the other have been recovered. The dynastic relationship between the early and later Chalukya families was established by the discovery of the Bodana inscription of Arikesari and that between the Rashrtakutas of Mālkhed and the Chalukyas, as overlords and feudatories, was made known for the first time by the examination of the Kārjol inscription of Śaka 879 and the Narasalgi inscription of Śaka 886 both belonging to the reign of Kṛṣṇa III and mentioning Taila II as

administering Taddevādi-nāḍu under him. The Kakhaṇḍki inscription of Śaka 915 introduced Taila II as ruling from Mānyakheṭa which established beyond doubt that the later Chalukyas of Kalyani rose from a position of subordination to the Imperial rank in the Rashtrakuta dominions. New families of subordinate chiefs viz., those of Nagire and Hāḍuvaḷḷi under the Vijayanagara kings were unearthed from oblivion by the survey of the Bhatkal Peth of the North Kanara District, conducted by the Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar.

The most outstanding discoveries of the Kannad Research Institute in 1941 are those of a Prakrit pillar inscription in Brāhmī characters of the 2nd century B. C., at Vadgaon-Mādhavapur near Belgaum and of the cliff inscription of Chalukya Vallabheśvara (Pulikeśin I) dated Śaka 465, at Bādāmi. The former refers to the celebration of a number of Vedic sacrifices and is thus the earliest Brahmanical Prakrit document known to exist in the Bombay Karnatak. The latter furnishes the earliest example of the use of the Śaka era in documents and is also the first and the only inscription of Pulikeśin I.

Among other important discoveries of the last decade may be mentioned the interesting Siroḍa plates of Devarāja which brought to light a new dynasty of kings called the Gomins in the 4th century A. D., in the Goa territory, the Haldipur copper plate grant of Pallavarāja Gopāladeva belonging to the 8th century A. D., which, besides furnishing a specimen of archaic Kannada prose, establishes the serfdom of the Pallava chiefs under the early Chalukyas, the Bodanaṁpaḍu inscription of Vikramāditya I testifying to the early Calukyan sway so far north on the East coast as Guntur District, the sets of copper plates of the Kaliṅgādhipati kings viz., Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman, Umavarman, Anantaśaktivarman, Anantavarman etc., who ruled over Kaliṅga about the 6th and 7th century A. D., a unique western Gaṅga grant of Mārasiṁha II which furnishes, like the Kuḍalur grant of the same king, a detailed account of the several kings of the family and introduces the Jain Guru Elācārya as the donee, who is evidently identical with the Helācārya of Hemagrāma (Talil Ponnur, North Arcot District). The Buddhist rock-cut caves, caverns and inscriptions were found in the Godavari, Vizagapatam and Guntur Districts and the earliest rock-cut temple dedicated to Śiva was noticed at Pillaiyarpatti in the Ramnad District. In the Bombay Karnatak, exquisite paintings of the 6th century A. D., were discovered in cave No. III at Bādāmi, and rock

carvings and paintings of the prehistoric period were brought to the notice of scholars at Gombigudda and Nurālphaḍi in the Jamkhandi State and published with sketches in the *Kannada Research Report* for 1939-40. A rock-cut cave temple of about the 10th century A. D. was also discovered at Kundgol in the Jamkhandi State.

IV. Archaeological research in the Native States

The contribution of the Mysore and Hyderabad Archaeological Departments to the unravelling of the cultural history of the Deccan and Karnatak is likewise varied in character. The discoveries of the Chandravalli rock-inscription of Kadamba Mayūraśarman, the Halmiḍi stone inscription of Kadamba Mṛgeśa, which furnishes the earliest specimen of the archaic Kannada (5th century A. D.), the Paṇḍarangapaḷḷi grant of Avidheya Rashtrakuta (6th century A. D.) and several Western Gaṅga grants, by the Mysore Archaeological Department have helped to settle with precision problems connected with the Karnatak history and the Kannada language. R. Narasimhachar's monographs on the Keśava temple at Somanāthpur, and the temples at Belur and Doddagaddavalli are valuable in understanding and fixing up the characteristic features of the Hoysala style of architecture. The preservation of the world-famous Ajaṇṭā frescoes and the conservation of the monuments in the State are the most outstanding achievements of the Hyderabad Archaeological Department. In the domain of exploration and excavation of ancient archaeological sites, both the Departments at Mysore and Hyderabad have done notable work of which a brief mention has been made already. The Chandravalli site of the Sātavāhana period and the Maski and Kondapur sites of the same age have already yielded a large number of terracotta figures illustrating the cultural life of the people in the pre-Christian or early centuries of the Christian era.

In the domain of South Indian numismatics much has not been done since the publication of Elliot's *South Indian Coins*, though a few new specimens of coins have been noticed now and then. The important lacuna in the history of South Indian Coinage have to be filled up by the discoveries and study of coins of the Early Kadamba, Early Chalukya and Rashtrakuta kings of the Deccan and the Śālaṅkāyana and Viṣṇukuṇḍin kings of the East coast. The value of the study of numismatics in clearing up some dark corners of South Indian history need not be underestimated and a serious

attempt must be made to collect and study the ancient coins by the Research Institutes in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies.

V. Museum

The Museum movement in South India which is a part of the activities of the Provincial Governments has gathered a great momentum as a result of the publication of a report by Messrs Markhan and Hargreaves who surveyed the Museums of India on behalf of the Museums Association of Great Britain. The Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, and the Government Museum, Madras, have developed the archæological sections on scientific lines and the student of art and architecture will find enough material for his study, well-arranged and labelled. But with the spread of education, the Museum service should be strengthened and a strong link should be established between Museums and the Educational institutions in the Province. Government should start more Museums in areas where their need is felt and help should be extended to private efforts in this direction. The Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, has started a Museum of valuable basic materials such as sculptures, inscriptions, and bronze and copper images of much iconographical interest which is capable of an all-round development, since Bombay Karnatak is proverbially rich in all sorts of antiquarian remains deserving protection and preservation provided the Government and the public extend necessary encouragement for its fruition. Except in Bombay and Madras, there is not one single efficient Museum of archæology in the whole of South India and this want should be soon removed by the establishment of the Karnatak Museum at Dharwar.

The only repositories of ancient fresco paintings known to the student of fine arts are Ajaṇṭā (5th century A. D.), Bādāmi (6th century A. D.), and Sittaṇṇa Vāśal in the Pudukottoi State (7th century A. D.). The first has been treated and rescued from deterioration and the second and the third have not yet received the full attention they deserve.

VI. Publications

The publications bearing upon South Indian Archæology and epigraphy have been of late so numerous that it will not be possible to enumerate them all in this short notice. The most important among them may be mentioned: The Volumes of South Indian Inscriptions (texts)-IV to XI, containing the texts of Kannda, Telugu

and Tamil inscriptions from the Madras Presidency and parts of the Bombay Karnatak and the *Karnatak Inscriptions* Vol. I published by the Kannada Research Institute (Bombay Government) are a mine of information on various topics of the South Indian cultural history. The Reports on South Indian Epigraphy (1917-1936), the *Annual Report of Kannada Research*, Bombay Province (1939-40) and the Bulletins of the Deccan College Post Graduate Research Institute give scientific analysis, classification and study of the basic material studied by the respective Institutions at Madras, Dharwar and Poona.

The progress achieved in the archæological researches in South India may be characterised as being still in the infant stage in view of the vast field remaining unexplored before us, but it is gratifying to note that the public and the Government are now canvinced of the necessity of preserving and studying the cultural heritage of our nation which is the greatest source of inspiration and pride to the scholars as well as to the laymen. It is hoped that with the grace of the Almighty, the horrid clouds of war that have gathered thickly over the horizon of our country will ere long be scattered away and the age of peace and plenty will be ushered in when cultural researches can be conducted with a single-minded devotion.

VII. Important Bibliography

1. Indian Pre-historics—Bruce Foote
2. Archæological Survey of India—Annual Reports (1917-36)
3. Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy (1917-36)
4. South Indian Inscriptions (Texts), Vols. IV to XI.
5. Bombay-Karnatak Inscriptions—Vol. I, part I.
6. *Karnatak Inscriptions*—Vol. I, by R. S. Panchamukhi
7. Annual Report on Kannada Research—by R. S. Panchamukhi (1939-40)
8. Annual Reports (Hyderabad Archæological Department) 1917 onwards.
9. Annual Reports (Mysore Archæological Department) 1917 onwards.
10. Bulletin of the Deccan College Post Graduate Research Institute, 1939 onwards.
11. The Progress of Science in India, during the past twenty-five years, 1938. " Progress of Archæology in India during the past twenty-five years (1912-1936)" by Rao Bahadur K. N. Dixit, M. A., F. R. A. S. B., Director General of Archæology in India.

PROGRESS OF GREATER INDIAN RESEARCH DURING THE LAST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS (1917-1942)

BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Afghanistan

The systematic investigation of ancient sites in Afghanistan dates only from 1922, when, thanks to the initiative of Prof. A. Foucher, France acquired from the Afghan Government a thirty years' monopoly for archæological exploration in the country. The opportunity thus presented in a land to which access had for some long time been barred with seven seals was eagerly utilised by a brilliant band of French scholars who gave to the world the results of their wonderful discoveries in a series of magnificent volumes (in French) called *Memoirs of the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan.* These works have revealed to us numerous traces of great schools of art—of sculpture in stucco and clay as well as mural paintings of the 3rd-4th to the 7th-8th centuries A. D.—to which have been given as indicative of their complex composition the designations of "Graeco-Buddhist" and "Irano-Buddhist" art. Fragmentary as they often are, these objects of art represent fresh and vigorous offshoots of the decadent art of Gandhāra and form in their turn, as has been well said, "an ante-chamber to the art of Central Asia" (René Grousset). For it was there that grew up those schools which were destined to attain their full development at Khotan, Kucha, Turfan and other famous Central Asian centres. We can only find time to describe here some of the more important discoveries that have rewarded the labours of the French archæologists.

On the site of Haḍḍa (known as Hi-lo by the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims and reputed to contain a collar-bone and a tooth of the Buddha), J. J. Barthoux discovered between 1925 and 1928 the remains of a vast ancient city with hundreds of *stūpas* and thousands of stucco sculptures. The results thus obtained were given out in two elaborate volumes (*Les Fouilles de Hadda* : tome iii, *Figures et Figurines*, Paris 1930 ; *Ibid.* tome i, *Stūpas et sites*, Paris 1933). The former contains reproductions with short descriptions of 478 sculptures, mainly all heads in stucco, representing figures of Bud-

dhas, demons and warriors, which were found among the ruins of the 531 *stūpas* at Haḍḍa, while the latter gives a minute account of the principles of construction of the *stūpas* and attached buildings as well as of the structures belonging to seven different areas. It is interesting to learn that the *stūpas* exhibit a development of the depressed forms of Bharhut and Sanchi towards more elevated, slender and graceful types, as they generally consist of " a double square basement supporting two cylindrical drums which in their turn are surmounted by a third low drum and a dome ". The stucco figures comprising those of Buddhas, of deities and demi-gods and of groups of human worshippers, indicate a masterly execution far surpassing the conventional and effeminate products of the Gandhāra school. Another famous site which has been examined by the French scholars is the cliff of Bāmiyān renowned from early times for its colossal Buddhas and its innumerable decayed cave-shrines and monasteries. Between 1922 and 1924 this famous group of monuments was thoroughly examined by A. Godard, Mme. Y. Godard and J. Hackin. In their great work called *Les antiquités bouddhiques de Bāmiyān* (Paris 1928), they reproduced a number of frescoes which have been rightly described as the earliest extant Buddhist paintings after those of Ajanta (Caves IX and X) and Miran. These paintings exhibit a strange medley of Indian, Iranian and Chinese influences and the earliest of them go back to the 5th or 6th century. Of the two colossal Buddhas which are adequately described, the earlier cannot be anterior to the 3rd century A. D. The authors also illustrate the famous Buddhist caves of Bāmiyān with adequate plans and designs. A new series of excavations undertaken at Bāmiyān by J. Hackin and J. Carl in 1930 led to the discovery of one of the oldest caves (*c.* 3rd century A. D.) in the vicinity of one of the colossal Buddhas. Other finds consisted of Sanskrit Mss. in birch-bark as well as an octagonal grotto (in the adjoining cliff of Karkak) with decorative paintings indicating Iranian influences. These finds have been described with adequate illustrations in Hackin and Carl's work *Nouvelles recherches archéologiques à Bāmiyān* (Paris 1933) where attention is drawn to the characteristic blending of Indian, Iranian and Hellenistic influences on the local art. The Iranian element, indeed, assumed from the end of the 5th century such an important part as to justify the application of the epithet ' Irano-Buddhist ' to the later art of Bāmiyān. The Sanskrit Mss. from Bāmiyān were edited (*J. A.* 1932) by the late Prof. Sylvain Lévi who identified them as comprising fragments of Abhidharma texts mostly of the Mahāyāna

school, of Vinaya of the Mahāsaṁghikas and of a rare Abhidharma text of the Sarvāstivādins. About this time J. Hackin published (Paris 1933)' a summary of the work of the school under the title *The Work of the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan* (*1922–32*). While the French explorations at Haḍḍa and Bāmiyān have yielded the happiest results, discoveries of striking interest have also been made at less known sites. At the hill of Khair Khāneh, north-west of Kabul, J. Carl excavated in 1934 the remains of a most interesting shrine recalling the construction of the Śivite temple of Gupta times at Bhumara in Central India. Another discovery was that of a unique Sūrya image in white marble showing distinct influences of Iranian art of the 4th century A. D. (See J. Hackin and J. Carl, *Recherches archéologiques au Col du Khair Khaneh près de Kabul*, Paris 1936. A shorter description also illustrated with plates is given by J. Hackin in *JGIS.* III, No. 1, Jan. 1936). The excavations of J. Hackin on the ancient site of Begram (Kāpiśī of Sanskrit literature) in 1937 resulted in the discovery of a mass of ivories with designs recalling the Mathura art of the Kushan epoch and forming in fact the only surviving samples of Indian ivory work of that early date. (For a description of the above illustrated with plates, see J. Hackin, *Recherches Archéologiques à Begram*, tome I, Text, tome II, Plates, Paris, 1939). The very interesting excavations of the French archæologists at Fondukistan, east of Bāmiyān, in 1937 brought to light an old (7th century) Buddhist sanctuary with its appendages. Among the most precious discoveries on this site are a number of clay modellings and mural paintings of predominantly Indian type recalling Gupta and Pala models (See J. Hackin, *The Buddhist Monastery of Fondukistan*, *JGIS.* VII, Nos. 1 and 2, Jan. and July 1940).

Central Asia

In the first seven or eight centuries of the Christian era the Chinese province of Sinkiang (or Eastern Turkestan), now almost wholly a sandy waste, was a land of smiling cities with rich sanctuaries and monasteries stocked with magnificent libraries and works of art. With a population at present predominantly Muslim in religion and Turkish in speech, it was in those days, by virtue of its geographical situation the meeting-place of diverse peoples of Iranian, Indian, Turkish, Chinese, Tibetan and other speeches and of diverse religions, Buddhist, Manichaean, Nestorian, Christian and so forth. The chance finds, during the last decade of the 19th

century, of Mss. in Sanskrit, Prakrit and unknown languages together with those of antiquities displaying affinities to the Hellenistic art of Gandhāra, stimulated the zeal of M. A. Stein, already famous as the editor and translator of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. A handsome subsidy from the Government of India enabled him to accomplish (1900–1901) his much-desired object of an archaeological expedition into Central Asia. The result of this mission so fully justified itself as to enable Stein, with the usual assistance of the Government of India, to lead two more archaeological expeditions into the country (1906–1908 and 1913–1916). The other nations were not behind hand in following Stein's example. There ensued a sort of international competition for unveiling the secrets of the lost Asiatic civilisation. A German expedition under the auspices of the Royal Museum of Ethnography in Berlin led by A. Grünwedel and E. Huth visited the regions of Turfan and Kucha (1902–1903). This was followed by the first Royal Prussian expedition (1904–1905) led by A. von Le Coq, a second one (1905–1907) under Grünwedel and Le Coq, and a third one (1913–1914) under Le Coq. The German Missions synchronised with a series of Russian expeditions of which the second one visited Kucha in 1906, the third discovered the ancient city of Karakhoto in 1908, while the fourth surveyed Tun-Huang in 1914. The Japanese, not to be outdone by other nations, sent two successive missions (1902–1904, 1908–1909) to visit Turfan, Kucha, Khotan and other sites. The French had also their share in what had now become an international enterprise. A mission under Paul Pelliot visited (1906–09) Kucha, Tun-huang and other sites, from which it brought back a rich spoil of Mss. and objects of art. In 1927–28 Emil Tinkler visited a part of Chinese Turkestan discovering stucco sculptures in Gandhāra style and frescoes similar to those of Miran. (See his report in *Sinica*, Vol. VI, pp. 34–40). Three successive expeditions led by B. Dénikė into Russian Turkestan between the years 1924 and 1928 resulted in the discovery at the ancient site of Termėz, visited by Hiuen Tsang (*c.* 630 A. D.), of Buddhist antiquities betraying Gandhāra influence (See A. Strelkoff, *Les monuments pre-Islamiques de Termėz*, in *Artibus Asiae*, 1928–29). In recent times Renascent China has boldly asserted its claim to the fellowship of the advanced nations of the East and the West by sending its own missions of archaeological exploration into Central Asia.

The epoch-making discoveries following from the above expeditions, which can only be compared for their magnitude and interest

with those of the lost civilisations of Egypt and Babylonia, began to be made known to the world outside in the first decade of the present century. In his *Sandburied Ruins of Khotan* Stein gave a popular account of his first expedition, while a scientific description of the same was given in his great work *Ancient Khotan* (Vol. I, Text, Vol. II, Plates, London 1907). Among the sites described by the daring explorer as yielding the most important Indian antiquities may be mentioned Dandan-oilik, Niya, Endere and Rawak. From the ruins of Buddhist shrines and monasteries at these places were obtained tempera paintings and stucco images, Buddhist texts written in Sanskrit and other languages on paper and other materials in varieties of the Gupta script, wooden documents written in north-western Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī script, these last relating to matters of official correspondence, official and semi-official records and so forth. In the meantime Grünwedel published his valuable report on his archaeological work in the Turfan region. (*Bericht über archaeologische Arbeiten in Idykutschari und Umgebung*, München 1906) and another volume on the old Buddhist cult-places in Chinese Turkestan (*Alt-Buddhistischen Kultstätten in Chinesisch Turkestan*, Berlin 1912). Shortly afterwards Le Coq published his work *Chotscho* (Berlin 1913) describing the Buddhist sculptures and mural paintings of that ancient city which showed the Hellenistic Gandhāra art as yielding to Sassanian and East Asian influences. These fruitful labours were cut short by the outbreak of the Great World-War in 1914, but no sooner was that tragic episode over than the work was resumed in right earnest. Stein gave a " Detailed Account " of his second Central Asian expedition in his stupendous work *Serindia* in three volumes (London 1921), a " Personal Narrative " having been already published by the same author under the title *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (London 1911). The chief discoveries of Indian antiquities effected during this expedition were made at Khadalik, Niya, Endere, Lou-lan and Miran and lastly and above all, Tun-huang on the outskirts of the Chinese province of Kansu. From the first five sites were acquired Buddhist stucco figures and wall-paintings, Sanskrit, Prakrit, Khotanese and other Mss., wooden sculptures with Indian *motifs*, documents in Kharoṣṭhī script and north-western Prakrit on wood, paper and silk. At the last-named site Stein had the good fortune of recovering from an ancient walled-up library an immense mass of Buddhist Mss. in Sanskrit, Khotanese and Kuchean along with hundreds of Buddhist paintings on silk, cotton and paper as well as thousands of Chinese and Tibe-

tan records dating from the 5th to 10th century A. D. A "Detailed Report" of Stein's third expedition was published in his last great work *Innermost Asia* in four volumes (Oxford 1928). The most interesting finds of Indian antiquities were made during these expeditions at Niya and Miran, at Karakhoto and at Murtuk in the Turfan oasis. The objects recovered consisted of Buddhist wall-paintings, Buddhist Mss. and block-prints in a variety of languages, wooden documents of a secular character in north-western Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī script and so forth. From Karakhoto ("The Black City") forming part of the ancient Tangut (Hsi-hsia) kingdom Stein acquired a mass of wooden sculptures illustrating Jātaka scenes as well as figures of enthroned Buddhas, of Buddhist saints, and of Brahmanical deities mounted upon their *vāhanas*. In the meantime Grünwedel produced his monograph on the ruins of Kucha (*Alt-Kutscha*, Berlin 1920). The report of the expedition of the Russian Geographical Society (1907-09) containing a description of the dead city of Karakhoto was published by Kozlov and Filchner (Authorized German trans. by L. Breitfuss and P. G. Zeidler, Berlin 1925). Of the official German expeditions, known as the Royal Prussian Expeditions, a popular account was given by Le Coq in his short work in German called *On the Trail of Hellas in Eastern Turkestan* (*Auf Hellas Spuren in Ost-Turkestan*, Leipzig 1926; English trans. under title "*Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan*" by Anna Barwell, London 1929). A brief sketch of his discoveries was given by Le Coq in his German work called *A Picture-Atlas relating to the History of Art and Culture in Central Asia* (*Ein Bilderatlas zur Kunst-und Kulturgeschichte Mittle-Asiens*, Berlin 1925). The sites mentioned by the author as yielding the most interesting Indian antiquities were Sangim, Bazaklik and Kyzil. At the first-named site was discovered an important collection of Buddhist Mss. The second which was the seat of a great Buddhist monastic establishment with hundreds of temples yielded wall-paintings of Indian monks in yellow robes (with names written in Central Asian Brāhmī) and those of East Asiatic monks in violet garb (with names written in Chinese and Tibetan). The last site which was a flourishing settlement between the 5th and 8th centuries A. D. yielded sculptures and paintings which were alike Indo-Iranian in character, besides Mss. in early Indian scripts. The results of J. Hackin's explorations on the site of Bazaklik already visited by Grünwedel were recorded in his work *Recherches archéologiques en Asie Centrale*, (Paris 1931) mentioning Buddhist sanctuaries with

maṇḍalas or apparitions of Tantric divinities. A full account of the results obtained by the Japanese expeditions in Central Asia and other lands during 1902-04, 1908-09 and 1910-14 under the auspices of Count Kozui Otani was published in Japanese by Y. Uehara (2 volumes, Tokyo 1937).

During the last two decades the wonderful records of the lost civilisation of Central Asia, which have been the spoils of the international enterprises above described have been systematically investigated by a host of scholars. We shall speak first of the objects of art which have been recovered from the various sites. The sculptures, miniatures, wall-paintings and images that were acquired by the Royal Prussian Expeditions have been brilliantly reproduced with adequate short descriptions by Prof. Le Coq in a series of volumes (in German) bearing the title *The Buddhist Late Classical Art in Central Asia* (*Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien*, Berlin 1922-24). The title 'Late-Antique' is explained by the fact that the author held the art-objects to be based on a late phase of the ancient Greek art. Of this work it has been rightly said that it ranks among the finest productions of modern German colour-process and photo-lithography. It consists of seven parts bearing the titles, I. The Plastic, II. The Manichaean miniatures, III. The Wall-paintings, IV. The Atlas of Wall-paintings and V, VI, and VII. New Sculptures. To the last Part E. Waldschmidt has added an essay on the style of the wall-paintings from Kyzil identifying nearly eighty Jātakas and Avadānas and noticing the blending of Hellenistic, Indian and Iranian elements in the composition. Of equal interest with the above is the publication of the art-objects recovered from the world-famed "Caves of the Thousand Buddhas" at Tun-huang by the Pelliot and Stein expeditions in a series of magnificent volumes. Prof. Pelliot published in six Parts a portfolio of three hundred and seventy-six Plates illustrating his collection cf Buddhist paintings and sculptures from the 182 caves of the monument (P. Pelliot, *Les grottes de Touen Houang* ; *Peintures et sculptures bouddhiques des epoques des Wei, des T'ang et des Song*, tomes 1-3, Paris 1920, tomes 4-5, Paris 1921, and tome 6, Paris 1924). The paintings on silk and linen banners from the Stein collection belonging to the late ninth and early tenth centuries were similarly reproduced in the work *The Thousand Buddhas* ; *Ancient Buddhist paintings from the cave-temples of Tun-huang on the Western frontier of China recovered and described by Sir Aurel Stein. Introductory essay by L. Binyon. Descriptive text by A. Stein*, London 1921. A catalogue

of five hundred and fifty-four paintings of the Stein collection (of which two hundred and eighty-two are preserved in the *British Museum* and the rest in the *Central Asian Antiquities Museum* at Delhi) was published by A. Waley in 1931. It contains along with general notices of the iconography and styles of the paintings, minute descriptions of the individual pieces. Useful catalogues of the Stein collection of wall-paintings have since been published by F. H. Andrews (Delhi 1933 and 1935). Of these paintings it may be said that while they are all Buddhistic with a few Manichaean, they are mainly inspired by late Hellenistic art, their dates ranging from the third to the tenth centuries A. D. The reproduction of these wall-paintings, which has been undertaken by the Government of India still awaits publication.

From a general review of the Indian antiquities described by the above authors it appears that a few of them belong to the Brahmanical culture. Such are the seals with effigies of Kubera and Trimukha discovered by Stein at Niya (abandoned before the end of the 2nd century A. D.) and the painted Gaṇeśa at Endere. But by far the largest number of paintings and sculptures belongs to the Mahāyānist Buddhist culture. The figures or scenes represented are those of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and lesser divinities, of the Buddhist paradise, of Maṇḍalas and they are often accompanied by figures of donors of a particularly individualistic type. Thus in his great work *Serindia* (Chs. XXII-XXIII) Stein divides the paintings from the closed chapel at the *Caves of the Thousand Buddhas* into five classes according to the subjects. These are (1) Scenes from Buddha's life, (2) Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, (3) Lokapālas and Vajrapāṇis, (4) Divine groups and (5) Buddhist paradise. While the topics of most of the paintings are Buddhistic they belong to an extraordinary variety of styles. At Turfan Grünwedel was able to distinguish no less than five or six different schools of paintings : Gandharian, Indo-Scythian, old Turki, Uigur and Tibetan. The same variety of styles has been noticed by Le Coq in his description of the wall-paintings in the second Part of his work on Buddhist Late Classical Art above mentioned. The paintings from the *Caves of the Thousand Buddhas* which illustrate the Buddhist religious art of the T'ang period (618-907 A. D.) and have been described to be for China what Ajaṇṭā is for India, have been shown (Cf. Pelliot *Les grottes de Touen Houang*) to represent the mingling of Chinese, Graeco-Indian and Iranian elements. To illustrate the cosmopolitan character of the Buddhist art of Central Asia, one further example will suffice. As

Stein has shown, the frescoes of the ancient Buddhist sanctuaries at Miran which are dated about the 4th century A. D. have affinities with the Romano-Syrian and the Copto-Hellenistic art of the early Christian centuries.

From the point of view of Greater Indian research the chief interest, naturally enough, belongs to the discovery, at various Central Asian sites, of Buddhist and other Indian texts written in Sanskrit and Prakrit as well as in the various local languages current at the time. Written in ink on birch-bark or paper or wood or leather in Kharoṣṭhī or several varieties of the Indian Gupta script, these texts (along with others in Chinese and Tibetan) have restored to us, if in fragments, numerous works of Indian literature either in their originals or by translations. In the task of publication of these precious records, the pioneer worker was the late A. F. Rudolf Hoernle who edited in the last decade of the 19th century the celebrated Bower Mss. acquired by Lt. Bower in 1889 in the course of his journey through Kucha. These Mss. written in Sanskrit on birch-bark in North-West Gupta characters of the 5th century A. D. consisted of a miscellaneous collection of medical treatises, proverbial sayings and the like. Other Mss. of the same type from the Central Asian collections called after Godfrey, Macartney and Weber were edited by Hoernle in the closing years of the last century. More important was the publication by the illustrious French scholar E. Senart (*J. A.* 1898) of the fragment of the Dhammapada in the North-Western Prakrit, and in Kharoṣṭhī script acquired by Dutreuil de Rhins at Khotan in 1893. The rich store of materials acquired by the organised Central Asian expeditions from the early years of the present century has been the occasion for a fresh series of scholarly publications. Selected Sanskrit Buddhist texts of the Stein collections from Tun-huang were edited by Sylvain Lévi (*J. A.* 1910) and by Vallée Poussin (*J. R. A. S.* 1911, 1912, 1913). In the *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan* ed. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Vol. I, (Oxford 1916), Hoernle, Lüders, Pargiter and F. W. Thomas published the text and translation (with notes and comparison of parallel versions) of the fragments of no fewer than twenty-six Buddhist texts from the Sanskrit canon. Of these no less than twenty-one belong to the Vinaya and the (Mahāyāna as well as Hīnayāna) *Sūtra-piṭaka*, while two are *stotras* of the celebrated poet Mātṛceṭa, of which I-tsing wrote in the seventh century : ' These charming compositions are equal in beauty to the heavenly flowers,

and the high principles which they contain rival in dignity the lofty peaks of a mountain.' The texts are written in "upright" and "slanting" Gupta characters of the 4th or 5th century and the Mss. were recovered from various Central Asian sites. An *Inventory List of Manuscript Remains mainly in Sanskrit* by F. E. Pargiter and another *Inventory List of Manuscript Remains in Sanskrit, Khotanese and Kuchean* by Sten Konow were published as Appendices E and F to Stein's *Innermost Asia* already mentioned. Meanwhile, H. Lüders started a masterly series of publications of 'Smaller Sanskrit texts' recovered by the Royal Prussian Turfan expeditions. In the first volume of the series called *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen* (*Kleinere Sanskrit Texte* I, Leipzig 1911) Lüders edited with his usual scholarly thoroughness fragments of three Sanskrit dramas (including the *Śāriputra-prakaraṇa* of Aśvaghoṣa) written on palm-leaf in the script of the Northern Kṣatrapa and Kushan inscriptions, which were found by Le Coq at Mingoi, and have been shown to be the oldest specimens of the Sanskrit drama. In the same series Lüders contributed (Leipzig 1926) his scholarly edition of the fragments of the *Kalpanā-maṇḍitikā* of Kumāralāta, a collection of pious legends after the fashion of Jātakas and Avadānas written by one of Aśva-ghoṣa's junior contemporaries. In recent times E. Waldschmidt has published (in German) in the same series (Leipzig 1923 and 1926) fragments of the *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* of the Sarvāstivādins and the first volume of fragments of Buddhist *sūtras* from the Central Asian Sanskrit canon. With this we may mention the editions of the Sanskrit original of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, with Tibetan and Chinese versions by Baron A. von Stäel-Holstein (Shanghai 1926). Among Indian scholars who have taken part in the publication of Central Asian Sanskrit texts we may mention N. P. Chakravarti who has edited and translated a text of the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* from the Pelliot collection (*L'Udānavarga*, Paris 1930).

We have now to notice the advance, in the last two decades, of the study and interpretation of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions in North-Western Prakrit which have been found in such large numbers at Khotan and other sites. Unlike the Sanskrit texts the Prakrit documents are of a wholly secular character. We learn from them how this Indian language of the North-western regions was used in Khotan and neighbouring areas in the early centuries of the Christian era not only for administration but also for the business of every-day life. Indeed it has been shown that the Khotan region was ruled in these early days by kings bearing Indian names with

the dynastic title '*vijita*' (See Sten Konow, *Remarks on the Khotanese Jātakastava*, I. H. Q. XVI, 1940). The complete reproduction of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions of the Stein collection is due to the joint labours of several English and French scholars whose work appears under the title *Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan.* Part I : *Text of inscriptions discovered at the Niya site, 1901,* transcribed and edited by the Abbe Boyer, E. J. Rapson and E. Senart, 1920. Part II : *Text of inscriptions discovered at the Niya, Endere and Lou-lan sites, 1906-7,* transcribed and edited (as above) 1927. Part III : *Text of inscriptions discovered at the Niya and Lou-lan sites, 1913-14,* transcribed and edited by E.J. Rapson and P. S. Noble, 1929. In his work *The language of the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese Turkestan,* (Cambridge 1937) T. Burrow has shown how this language corresponds closely to the post-Asokan inscriptions from North-Western India and less closely with the Prakrit version of the Dhammapada. The same scholar has very recently published *A translation of the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese Turkestan,* (London 1940) giving a translation of all the 740 documents—letters, reports, official orders, judgments, etc.—that were discovered by Sir Aurel Stein at the Central Asian sites.

Passing to the Indian records preserved in the new Indo-European language of Central Asia which has been found to be closely allied to the Italo-celtic languages we have to begin by pointing out that it exists in two dialects centering around Karashar and Kucha. These have been respectively called Tokharian A and B from their supposed connection with the ancient Tukhāras. With better reason they have been respectively styled Karasharian and Kuchean from their respective centres. For the publication of texts in these languages we are indebted mainly to French and German scholars. In *J. A. S. B.* 1901 Hoernle published Kuchean fragments of a medical treatise from Central Asia, of which however he was unable to offer any interpretation. Later on Sylvain Lévi and A. Meillet edited (*J. A.* 1911-12) fragments of a fresh Kuchean medical treatise, while Lévi edited (*Manuscript Remains,* Oxford 1916) the Kuchean *Prātimokṣa* and its historical commentary belonging to the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya. The last-named scholar published his *Notes on Ms. Remains in Kuchean* as Appendix G to Stein's *Innermost Asia.* Above all he edited and translated a series of Buddhist texts, *Udānavarga, Udānasūtra, Udānālaṁkāra and Karmavibhaṅga* (*Fragments de textes Koutchéens,* Paris 1933). While Kuchean texts have thus been interpreted by Sylvain Lévi

from the Stein and other collections, those in the sister dialects from the Grünwedel and Le Coq collections have been studied by German scholars. To E. Sieg and W. Siegling we owe the publication of Buddhist fragments (*Tocharische Sprachreste*, 1921) and a classical grammar (*Tocharische Grammatik*, 1931) in the " Tocharian " language. Meanwhile E. Leumann published (Strassburg 1919) the Tocharian text and German translation of the *Maitreyasamiti* of the poet Āryacandra. To Prof. Lüders belongs the credit of discovering not only the original name *Agnideśa* of Karashar, but also a list of its kings, Indrārjuna, Candrārjuna, and so forth. Of the two regions Kucha and Karashar, the first has been shown by Prof. Lévi (*J. A.* 1913) to have played by far the more important part in the propagation of Buddhism into China. Reference may be made in this connection to the famous Kumārajīva of Kucha, one of the greatest apostles of Chinese Buddhism. As Lévi has shown (*J. R. A. S.* 1914), the existing records prove that the civilisation of Kucha was wholly Indian and Buddhist. Sanskrit evidently was the sacred language. The Kātantra grammar was studied and, as is shown by the surviving parallel versions of Sanskrit and Kuchean texts, *verbatim* translations were made from the Sanskrit. The surviving Kuchean literature consists of fragments of the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin school, of imitations of Sanskrit Avadānas, of Mahāyāna and Buddhist Tantrik texts, and lastly, of works of half-dramatic, half-narrative type with Buddha and mythical kings as heroes, and Vidūṣaka as their attendant.

Besides the records preserved in the Indo-European language just noticed, Central Asia has yielded other texts written in Soghdian and Khotanese (otherwise called 'Saka' and 'North-Aryan'), two hitherto 'unknown languages' belonging to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European family. During the last two decades the Buddhist texts in Soghdian have been published mainly by French and German scholars such as P. Pelliot, E. Benveniste, F. Willer and F. W. K. Müller. To the German scholar Hans Reichelt we owe the publication and translation of the Soghdian Ms. fragments of the British Museum collection in two parts (*Die Soghdischen Handschriftenreste des britischen Museums*, I Teil, *Die buddhistischen Texte*, II Teil, *Die nicht-buddhistischen Texte*, Heidelberg 1928). The *Notes on Manuscript Remains in Sogdian* by E. Benveniste and the *Inventory List of Ms. Fragments on Uighur, Mongol and Sogdian* by A. von Le Coq were published as Appendices H and K in Stein's great work *Innermost Asia* above mentioned. *Essai de grammaire*

Sogdienne was published in two parts (Part I by R. Gauthiot, Paris 1921 and Part II by E. Benveniste, Paris 1929). As for the Khotanese texts Sten Konow published (*Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford 1916) two complete Khotanese manuscripts of the *Vajracchedikā* and the *Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra* from the Stein collection with translation, corresponding Sanskrit (or Sanskrit and Tibetan) versions and a vocabulary. The *Śaka Studies* by Konow (Oslo 1932) contained his edition of the fragments of the Middle-Iranian version of the *Saṁghātasūtra* with a grammatical sketch and Vocabulary of the language. A complete poem in Khotanese Saka, the Jātakastava of Jñānāśraya, has since been reproduced from the Stein collection of Tun-huang Mss. by H. W. Bailey (*B. S. O. S.*, IX 4). This interesting work is a collection of verses in praise of Buddha's deeds in previous births and is of the same nature as the Chariyāpiṭaka of the Pali canon. It is dedicated by its author to a king bearing the Indian name of Śrī Vijaya Sūra.

Coming to the Central Asian records written in the ancient Turki languages, we have to notice the important work done in the publication of Buddhist texts by German scholars. To F. W. K. Müller we owe the publication of a few Buddhist Uigur Mss. including fragments of the Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra and of Tantrik Texts from the Turfan finds (*A.B.A.* 1908, 1911; *S.B.A.* 1916; *S.P.A. W.* 1928, 1931 etc.). In a series of papers called *Türkische Turfan Texte* W. Bang and A. von. Gabain have published another series of Buddhist (including Tāntrik) Turkish texts from Turfan (*S. P. A. W.* 1930, 1931, 1934 etc.) Some Avadāna stories from the Turfan Manuscript fragments were translated by J. W. K. Müller in the series *Uigurica* (*S. P. A. W.* 1931 etc.).

We come now to the Indian documents written in the little known Tangut language, that have been recovered principally from the forgotten city of Karakhoto by the Russian expedition under Kozloff and the third Stein expedition as well as later Chinese missions. Here the important work has been done by French and Russian as well as Chinese and Japanese scholars. In *J. A.* 1914 and 1920 P. Pelliot published a few Buddhist texts from the Kozloff collection preserved in the Asiatic Museum at Leningrad. In the *Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping* (vol. IV, No. 3, May–June, 1930) a valuable collection of Buddhist texts in the same language together with a catalogue of Si-hia translation of the

Buddhist Tripiṭaka was published by a group of Chinese, Japanese and Russian scholars.

We have to notice in the last place the Chinese Buddhist documents recovered from Tun-huang and other sites by the several national expeditions. In the publication and interpretation of such texts very valuable work has recently been done by Japanese scholars. Of the great *Taisho Edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka* published by J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe in 55 Volumes (Tokyo 1924-29), Vols. 53 and 54 contained Mss. belonging to some of the important Central Asian collections. The valuable *Catalogue* of this monumental work (Tokyo 1929) gave a complete list of Chinese Buddhist Mss. from Tun-huang known till then. In the concluding volume (Vol. 85) of the complement to the Taisho edition in 30 volumes (Tokyo 1929-32) have been published the Tun-huang Mss. preserved in the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale and the Japanese collections. In 1933 K. Yabuki published a masterly commentary on the Tun-huang Mss. of the Stein Collection which had already been edited by him in 1931.

Of Indian literary works from Central Asian finds, which are preserved in Tibetan, it will be enough to mention one or two examples : In *Indian Studies in honour of Charles Rockwell Lanman* (Harvard University Press, 1929), F. W. Thomas published a paper on the Tibetan versions of the Rāmāyaṇa (dated 700-900 A. D.) : "It follows the general lines of the narrative in the *Mahābhārata* (*Vanaparvan*, Chs. 270-290), but the incidents and the nomenclature differ widely and indeed surprisingly". In his *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan* (Part II, Royal Asiatic Society, London), F. W. Thomas has translated all Tibetan documents found by Stein. The Chinese Buddhist texts from Tun-huang preserved in the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris, the National Library of Peiping and other collections have been examined by the Chinese scholars Lieuo Fou, Tch'en Yin-ko and Tch'en Yuan in the publications of the *Academia Sinica* (1930, 1931).

Tibet.

Tibet, the land of snow, derives its religion of Lamaism and its Lamaist church organisation, its religious art and its literature from Indian inspiration, if not from direct Indian authorship. To trace the recent progress of Tibetan studies in relation to Indian culture, we may properly begin with reference to the two grand divisions

(Kānjur and Tānjur) of its huge canonical literature which is so largely based on Indian originals. These two grand divisions were long known in the two editions called Peking ('red') and Narthāng ('black') editions. Afterwards there was discovered a new and better edition of the same from Sde-dge in Eastern Tibet. Besides Baron A. von Stael-Holstein brought to light (Peking 1934) a new Peking edition of the Kanjur, published in 1692, as compared with the other Chinese editions dated in 1410 and 1700. Another feature of recent times has been the preparation of new catalogues of the Tibetan canon which have wholly or partially superseded the older catalogues of the Kanjur by Csoma de Körös and I. J. Schmidt and of the Tanjur by Beckh. It is noticeable that in this work as in that of cataloguing the Chinese Tripiṭaka the lead has been taken by the Japanese scholars. The Tohoku Imperial University published in 1934 *A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons (Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur)* containing an index of the 103 volumes of the Kanjur and 205 volumes of the Tanjur in the Sde-dge edition. More important than the above is the work *A complete analytical catalogue of the Kanjur division of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka edited in Peking during the K'ang-hsi era* issued by the Otani University in three parts (1930, 1931, 1932). In this work each Sūtra is compared with its corresponding text in the Sanskrit, Pali and Chinese canons.

In recent times Tibetan Buddhist texts often accompanied with the available parallel versions have been published by a number of Russian, German, French, Italian, Japanese and Indian scholars. Among important volumes of Indian literature thus made available to the learned world we may mention valuable works on Logic like Diṅnāga's *Nyāyamukha* (ed. Tucci, 1930) and *Ālambanaparīkṣā* (ed. Yamaguchi, *J. A.* 1929), Śaṁkarasvāmin's *Nyāyapraveśa* (ed. V. Bhattacharyya, *G. O. S.* XXXIX, Baroda 1927), Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* (ed. Rahula Sankrityayana, *J.B.O.R.S.* 1938-39), important philosophical works like Nāgārjuna's own commentary (*Akutobhaya*) on his Mādhyamikakārikās (Tr. Max Walleser, Heidelberg 1911), the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra* of Maitreyanātha (ed. Stcherbatsky and Obermiller, Bib. Buddh. XXIII, 1929) and its commentary by Haribhadra (ed. Tucci, *G. O. S.* LXII and Wogihara, Tokyo 1932), Asaṅga's *Mahāyānasaṁgraha* (ed. E. Lamotte, Louvain 1939), Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* (Tr. in part by Vallée Poussin and Stcherbatsky), poetical works like Āryadeva's *Catuḥśataka* (ed. in part with extracts from Candrakīrti's commentary and English

tr., V. Bhattacharyya, Calcutta 1931). Reference may also be made to the publication by J. Bacot (Paris 1930) of a great Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary containing nearly 15000 more words than the well-known *Mahāvyutpatti.* A fundamental treatise on Tāntrism in the Far East, which exists in seven Chinese and three Tibetan versions as well as a half-Sanskrit and half-East-Iranian version has been thoroughly analysed by the Japanese scholar, S. Toganoo, in 1930. The title of this work has been restored in Sanskrit as Nayasūtra. The important *History of Buddhism* by Bu-ston has been translated from the Tibetan by E. Obermiller (1931).

Coming to religion and religious art we have to mention in the first place the publications of useful catalogues of Tibetan collections in different museums of Europe and Asia. Such are the Catalogue (in French) of the Indian and Tibetan sculptures in the Musée Guimet by J. Hackin (Paris 1931) and of the Tibetan collection in the Louis Finot Museum by C. Pascalis (Hanoi 1935). The enormous influence exercised by the Pāla and Sena art upon the sculpture and painting of Tibet has been stressed by René Grousset (*Les civilisations de l'Orient*, Tome IV, Ch 2, Paris 1930; Eng. Tr. by C. A. Phillips, London 1934). A first rate contribution to our knowledge of the tangled mythology of Tibet is the work, *Two Lamaist Pantheons from the materials collected by the late Baron A. von Stael-Holstein*, in two volumes (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass). Mention may also be made of the work, *The religion of Tibet*, by Sir Charles Bell (Oxford 1931). Of outstanding importance is the work *The Gods of Northern Buddhism* (2nd edition, London 1929) by Getty.

No one has done more in recent times to advance our knowledge of Tibetan art and archaeology than the indefatigable Italian explorer and scholar Guiseppe Tucci who has repeatedly visited the shrines and monasteries of Western and Eastern Tibet, collecting Mss. and objects of art and bringing to light unknown paintings and sculptures from its secluded cloisters. His penetrating studies have been published (in Italian) in successive volumes in the series *Indo-Tibetica* under the auspices of the Royal Academy of Italy. In the first volume of this series (Rome 1932) Tucci deals with the construction of the characteristic types of *stūpas* in Indian and Western Tibet. The author gives reasons for thinking that the Tibetan architectural processes relating to the construction of *stūpas* were entirely derived from India. It is interesting to learn that among the objects (ts'a ts'a) deposited in the *stūpas* there

are not only figures of Buddhist deities and sacred objects but also of the god Kārttikeya. In the second volume of the *Indo-Tibetica* (Rome 1933) Tucci gives the biography of the great Tibetan scholar, reformer and builder, who introduced a Buddhist renaissance into Tibet, about 1000 A. D. This great Tibetan monk, who refreshed his knowledge of Buddhism from three successive visits to India, wrote after his return no less than 158 works which Tucci classifies under the three heads of *Sūtras and Tantras*, *Commentaries on the Sūtras* and *Commentaries on the Tantras*. He was helped by a band of no less than seventy-five Indian scholars whom his royal patrons, the kings of Guge (Western Tibet), invited to their court. He also invited artists from Nepal, Bengal and Kashmir to build scores of temples and adorn them with sculptures and paintings. The chief temple was provided with images not only of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, but also of Tāntrik deities associated with the Guhyasamāja cycle. In the third volume of the *Indo-Tibetica* (Part I, Rome 1935 ; Part II, Rome 1936) Tucci describes a number of temples of Western Tibet with their sculptures and paintings specially from the point of view of their artistic symbolism. The chronicle of this mission written by Tucci's companion, E. Ghersi, was published separately by the Royal Academy of Italy in 1933. From the standpoint of Indian culture the interest of Tucci's description lies in its reference to the esoteric significance of the *maṇḍala* or Tāntric cycle adopted in the Tibetan temples. Mention may also be made of Tucci's discovery of some Buddhist frescoes of the 10th or 11th century in Western Tibetan shrines, recalling the paintings of Ajanta and Ellora (G. Tucci, *Indian Paintings in Western Tibetan Temples*, *Artibus Asiae*, (VII, 1937). Among Tucci's most recent discoveries may be mentioned that of the Mangrang monastery in Eastern Tibet with frescoes probably executed by Indian artists in the 12th century and wood-work done by Kashmirian craftsmen in the same period (*Illustrated London News*, Jan. 18,1936).

We may notice in the last place the fruitful travels (especially those of 1934 and 1936) of an Indian Buddhist monk, Rahula Sankrityayana, which have been rewarded with discoveries of Sanskrit palm-leaf Mss. in the hidden monastic libraries of Tibet. In *J.B.O.R.S.* XXI (1935) and XXIII (1937) he has listed a series of 184 and 326 separate Mss. which he discovered in the various Tibetan libraries.

Mongolia and Manchuria

For the investigation of Mongolian Buddhist literature we are chiefly indebted in recent times to Russian, German and Japanese

scholars. The West Mongol (Kalmuk) version of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra* (one of the favourite scriptures of Northern Buddhism) has been published by Erich Haenisch (*Asia Major* VIII, Leipzig). The Uigur text of the same Sūtra was edited (Bib. Buddh. XVII, 1913 ff.) by W. W. Radloff and S. E. Maloo, and was translated into German (Bib. Buddh. XXVII, Leningrad 1930) by the same scholars. In 1924 Russian scholars discovered a copy of the Mongol Tanjur at Urga. Another copy was discovered in 1929 by the Japanese Prof. Haneda who took it to the Imperial University of Kyoto. The former copy was utilised by B. Y. Vladimircov in his edition of the Mongolian version of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (Bib. Buddh. XXVIII, Leningrad 1929).

Coming to Manchuria we have to mention the discovery by the German scholar Walter Fuchs (*O. L. Z.* 33, 1930) of two copies of the Manchurian Kanjur in a monastery at Potala in Johol and its neighbouring temple.

Burma

By the ninth century of the Christian era Burma with its two great natural (Upper and Lower) divisions, bearing in the ancient indigenous records the names of Mrammadesa and Ramaññadesa, was occupied by at least three distinct peoples, all of whom were strongly influenced by Indian civilisation. In the north lay the Burmese kingdom (Mrammamaṇḍala) with its capital at Arimaddanapura (Pagan) founded in 849 A. D. In the south was situated the kingdom of the Pyu with its capital at Śrīkṣetra (old Prome identified with the modern village of Hmawza near Prome). To the south-east lay the kingdom of the Mons (or Talaings), kinsman at least by speech of the Khasis and Mundas of India, whose capital was located at Thaton and who had an important settlement at Haṁsāvatī (Pegu) founded early in ninth century. It is only by piecing together the evidence of the archaeological finds and stray Chinese literary references that the lost history of Burma in early times has been recently recovered, for notwithstanding the abundance of local chronicles the authentic history of the country dates only from 1057 A. D., the memorable year of the conquest of Thaton and Pegu by the Burmese king Anawrata.

The systematic investigation of the art and archæology of Burma begins only in the first decade of the present century, although the Archæological Department was established in 1899

and a serious search for antiquities had been made by Major (afterwards Sir) Richard Temple in 1894. The explorations of a French archæologist, General L. de Beylié, in 1905 and the following years, for the first time drew public attention to the wealth of antiquities at Prome. The first Superintendent of the Archæological Department, Taw Sein Ko, devoted his energies to the descriptions of some of the famous monuments of the 11th and 12th centuries at Pagan including the famous Ananda temple built by King Kyanzittha in 1090 (according to tradition) and the Mahabodhi temple built after the model of the Bodh-Gaya shrine by King Nandaungmya in 1198. He had, moreover, the good fortune of discovering, at Hmawza, funeral urns in earthenware and stone with inscriptions in the forgotten Pyu language, a stone inscription with extracts from the Pali canon and a Buddhist votive *stūpa* with images of the last four Buddhas and inscriptions in Pyu and Pali languages. These inscriptions were published by C. O. Blagden (*Ep. Ind.* xii) and Louis Finot (*J. A.* 1912). To Taw Sein Ko also belongs the credit of publishing six volumes of a *Corpus* of Burmese inscriptions. These are: I. Inscriptions of Pagan, Pirya and Ava, ed. T. S. Ko, 1892; II. Inscriptions copied from stones collected by King Bodawpaya, Vol. I, ed. T. S. Ko, 1897; III. Inscriptions copied from stones collected by King Bodawpaya, Vol. II, ed. T. S. Ko, 1897; IV. Inscriptions collected in Upper Burma, Vol. I, ed. T. S. Ko, 1900; V. Inscriptions collected in Upper Burma, Vol. II, ed. T. S. Ko, 1903; VI. Original Inscriptions collected by King Bodawpaya, ed. Charles Duroiselle after copy prepared by T. S. Ko, 1913. Containing mere transcripts in modern Burmese characters and neglecting the distinction between originals and copies, these volumes have been rightly condemned for their failure to satisfy the requirements of modern scholarship. During the first decade of this century, Blagden published the first tentative reading of Mon inscription (*JRAS*, 1909). This is the famous text on the Mon (or Telaing) face of the quadrilingual inscription of Myazedi, "the Rosetta stone of Telaing epigraphy." In *JRAS*, 1911, the same scholar compared the Pyu version of the above record with the Pali, Burmese and Mon versions. Afterwards he deciphered (*Journal of the Burma Research Society*, 1917) some Pyu inscriptions on the funeral urns discovered at Hmawza. Nevertheless it could justly be said by a competent scholar as late as 1913 that epigraphy in Burma was still to be founded (Charles Duroiselle, Preface to his edition of *The Original Inscriptions collected by King Bodawpaya* (Amarapura 1913). With the

closing years of the second decade of the present century began a period of substantial progress. In the first volume (1919) of the newly started Journal *Epigraphia Birmanica*, Blagden published his improved reading of the Mon version of the Myazedi inscription along with a glossary of Mon words. In this volume he also published the text and translation of the Pyu version of the same record. A series of *Mon Inscriptions* was published by the same scholar in the three succeeding volumes of the *Epigraphia Birmanica*. One of these inscriptions recording the erection of a palace at Pagan by King Kyanzittha mentions Brahmans bringing lustral water while Buddhist monks recited the *parittā* for protection of the building. The soul of this recent progress of Burmese archæology was Charles Duroiselle who became the first editor of the *Journal of the Burma Research Society* in 1911 and succeeded Taw Sei Ko as Archæological Superintendent in 1912. He published (Rangoon 1921) *A List of Inscriptions found in Burma*, Part I, *The list of inscriptions arranged in order of their dates*. In the three Appendices of this work he listed the Mon, Pyu Siamese and Tamil inscriptions. Three portfolios of *Inscriptions of Burma* (University of Burma Oriental Series Publications) consisting of accurate facsimiles of inscriptions from 1131 to 1237 A. D., those down to 1268 A. D. and those from 1268 to 1300 A. D., have since been published by Pe Maung Tin and G. Luce (Oxford 1933 and London 1939).

The very valuable excavations of Duroiselle on the site of Hmawza in 1926–27 resulted in the discovery of an untouched relic-chamber of a Buddhist *stūpa* of the 6th–7th century A. D. containing a "veritable wonder-house of archaeological treasures." The central object in the chamber was a gilt silver *stūpa* with Buddha figures in *repoussé* and a mixed Pali-Pyu inscription. Among other objects was a Ms. of 20 gold-leaves in Pyu characters of the 6th century containing extracts from the Pali canon. The characters of the inscription and the Mss. (like those of the gold plates and stone inscription discovered at Hmawza by Taw Sein Ko) bear affinities to those of the Kannada-Telugu and the Kadamba inscriptions of Southern India at the same period. Other discoveries made at the same site consisted of terracotta votive tablets with figures of a Buddha flanked by Avalokiteśvara and Maitreya, a Bodhisattva with four arms and so forth and with the Buddhist creed inscribed in Pali and Sanskrit in Nagari characters of the 8th–9th centuries. Duroiselle's discoveries at Hmawza in the following year consisted of a gold-plate inscription in Pali in the same South Indian charac-

ters, of a bronze Buddha image with Sanskrit inscriptions in Gupta characters on the pedestal, of a large stone Buddha statue with a mixed Sanskrit and Pyu inscription in Gupta characters of the 7th–8th century. (For details see *Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1926–27, 1927–28). These discoveries have opened a new chapter in the history of India's old culture-contact with Burma. They have definitely proved that in the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era an Indian or Indianised dynasty with names of kings ending in *varman* and *vikrama* was reigning at Prome. During the same period Theravāda (or Southern) Buddhism was the predominant religion in the kingdom, and the Pali canon was known even in its most abstruse aspects. The art-influence was derived both from the Northern Gupta traditions and the Southern Pallava style. The colonists came both from Northern and Southern India. Next in importance to the archaeological discoveries at Hmawza are those made by Duroiselle at Pagan, the capital city of the Burmese king which during a space of nearly two centuries (1057–1286) was adorned by a succession of royal builders with innumerable *stūpas*, shrines and monasteries. On this memorable site Duroiselle brought to light hundreds of stone sculptures and terracotta votive tablets inscribed with the usual Buddhist creed in a variety of languages (Sanskrit, Pali, Pyu, Talaing and Burmese). Some of the inscribed tablets written in Sanskrit in Nāgarī characters of the 11th century bear the name of the great Burmese King Anawrata, the conqueror of Thaton, in the Indian form Mahārāja Śrī Anuruddhadeva (*Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1915, 1926–27).

One of the important signs of the remarkable progress of Burmese archaeology in recent times has been the steady growth of museums. Not to speak of the Palace Museum at Mandalay containing the relics of the last Burmese dynasty, the Museums at Hmawza and Pagana have been greatly enriched with the finds of recent explorations.

The dark corners of the religious history of the Irrawady valley in the pre-Anawrata period have been illumined in recent times by the progress of research. In the middle of the second decade of this century because of the dearth of authentic documents it could still be said (Duroiselle in *Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1915–16) that the religious history of Burma upto the eleventh century was practically a blank. A great step forward was taken when Duroiselle identified the unique frescoes of a markedly erotic character from two old temples near Pagan as representing the Ari of the Burmese chronicle whom he

identified as Mahāyānist Buddhist sect deriving their origin from Bengal and deeply tinctured with Tāntrism (See Duroiselle's classical paper *The Ari of Burma and Tantric Buddhism, Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1915-16). This definitely proved the prevalence of Tāntrik Buddhism among the Burmese before the absorption of Theravāda Buddhism by King Anawrata. To Duroiselle also belongs the credit of recognising traces of Sanskrit (Sarvāstivādin) school in the Sanskrit records from Prome (*Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1913-14). In the last decade of this century an Indian scholar, Niharranjan Ray, has contributed a series of valuable studies on the religious history of Burma. In his *Brahmanical Gods in Burma* (Calcutta 1932) based on a critical study of the extant Brahmanical images and shrines in the country he has brought together all the known facts about the remanis of Brahmanism in Burma arranged in chronological order from the 7th to the 14th centuries A.D. His next important work *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma* (Calcutta 1935), based on an equally thorough study of plastic remains and literary references, gives comprehensive account of the fortunes of the Sarvāstivādin as well as the Mahāyāna and allied schools of Buddhism in the country from the earliest times. Among his main conclusions may be mentioned the fact that the Mūlasarvāstivādin canon was introduced into Old Prome probably from East India some time before the seventh century. Down to the eighth and ninth centuries it flourished side by side with the Theravāda school which had been introduced from the Kannada-Telugu country in the sixth century; in the eighth and ninth centuries Mahāyānism was introduced into Old Prome from Eastern India. In Pagan Mahāyānism was known before the tenth century, being imported at least in its Tāntrik phases from Bengal. Its most flourishing period coincided with the Golden Age of the Hīnayānist reformation at Pagan. Owing to the enlightened tolarance of the Burmese kings the two religions lived side by side, but Hīnayānism having the State support ultimately triumphed over its rival.

We may next mention two other publications by the last-named scholar (*Early Traces of Buddhism in Burma, J. G. I. S.* VI, Jan. and July, 1939; *Theravāda Buddhism in Burma*, Ibid VIII, Jan. 1941) forming the earlier chapters of a comprehensive history of Buddhism in Burma projected by himself. In the first paper the author has established by an elaborate examination of the literary and archaeological evidence that the famous tradition of Aśoka's sending (c. 250 B. C.) the mission of Sona and Uttara for the conversion of Suvaṇṇabhūmi has some claims to a historical basis,

that the equally famous tradition of Buddhaghoṣa's infusing a new life into the Buddhism of Lower Burma (c. 400–450 A. D.) has some probability in its favour, that the Pali canonical texts evidently brought over by Indian colonists from the Kannada-Telugu country were studied in their doctrinal and abstruse aspects in Old Prome (c. 400–450 A. D.), that Buddhism was in a very flourishing condition in that ancient capital (c. 550–950 A. D.), that Brahmanical Hinduism along with Buddhism was prevalent in Pegu and lastly that Theravāda Buddhism was exceedingly flourishing in the Talaing kingdom towards the middle of the eleventh century. In the second paper a good account has been given of the religious, artistic and literary activities of the Burmese people during the Golden Age of the Pagan dynasty (c. 1057–1286 A. D.). How ennobling was the Buddhist influence on the minds of these alien rulers has been illustrated by the following quotation from an inscription of King Kyanzittha, the builder of the Ananda temple: "With loving kindness......shall king Kyanzittha wipe away the tears of those who are parted from their trusted friends......his people shall be unto him as a child to its mother's bosom......he shall soften the hearts of those who intend evil. With wisdom which is even as a hand shall King Kyanzittha draw open the bar of the Gate of Heavan, which is made of Gold and wrought with gems."

The study of Burmese art for which materials were almost completely lacking as late as the middle of the second decade of this century (Cf. Duroiselle in *Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1913–14) has also shared in the general progress. It is true that a comprehensive history of this art involving the classification of types and schools and the analysis of their affinities down even to the end of the Pagan period has yet to be written. Nevertheless there has latterly been a good deal of preliminary studies in this direction. In his paper *Pictorial Representations of Jātakas in Burma* (*Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1912–13), Duroiselle gave a connected account of the sculptures and paintings illustrative of the Jātakas in Burmese temples from 1057 to 1820. Dealing with the style of these works of art he said that while the main influence came from Eastern India, the local Burmese and Talaing artists in copying the Indian models created what may be called the "Pagan school." In the same context he declared that every thing in the Jātaka relief except the style of the houses was Indian. The stone sculptures illustrative of Buddha's life from the corridor of the famous Ananda

temple at Pagan were noticed by Duroiselle in another paper (*Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1913-14) where he held them to be the work of Indian artists. In a third paper on the frescoes of Pagan (*Ann. Rep. A. S. I.*, 1921-22) he declared these paintings to be the work of Bengali and Nepalese artists. The illustrious French scholar G. Çœdés has recently suggested (*Le Musée National de Bangkok*, p. 31, Paris 1928) that the type of Buddha images of the early Pagan period in Burma and the early Tai period in Siam was directly derived from the Pāla art of Bengal and Bihar, a suggestion which has been confirmed by recent research (Le May, *Buddhist Art in Siam*, pp. 99 ff.). Quite recently Indian scholars have made weighty contributions to the study of religious art in Burma. Niharranjan Ray in his works on Burmese religious history has distinguished various Brahmanical and Buddhist sculptures at Hmawza and Pagan as belonging to the late Gupta, Pallava and Pāla styles. He has also pointed out that not only the *stūpas* but also the rectangular temples at Hmawza are indebted to the late Gupta and Pāla art traditions. In his paper *Painting in Pagan*(*J. I. S. O. A.*, VI, 1938) the same scholar has distinguished four stages of this art. At first the conception was mainly plastic, the decorations, dress and ornaments, types, colour-scheme and composition being imported from the East Indian tradition. When the process of Burmanisation began to work the plastic conception was overtaken by the linear. In the next stage the linear conception superseded the plastic, the colour-scheme etc. remaining purely Indian. In the fourth (or Burmese) state the linear conception came to stay. More recently Sarasi Kumar Saraswati (*Temples of Pagan*, *J. G. I. S.*, IX, 1, 1942) has shown that these temples divide themselves into three classes having their prototype in certain old shrines of Hmawza and that the Ananda temple, in particular, while resembling the Paharpur shrine in exterior elevation, differs fundamentally in plan, conception and internal arrangement.

By the first decade of the present century the investigation of the literary history of Burma had made substantial progress. Important chronicles, for which Burma is so famous, like the Gandhavaṁsa and the Sāsanavaṁsa, had been published before the close of the last century. These and other precious texts were utilised by Mabel Bode in her standard monograph *The Pali Literature of Burma* (London 1909) where she traced the development of Pali literature and scholarship in the country from the 11th to the 19th centuries. Among the branches of study developed during this

period are those quite familiar to students of Sanskrit literature viz. astronomy and astrology, law, medicine, rhetoric and prosody, and above all grammar.

The progress of scholarship in recent years has made possible the publication of an up-to-date general history of Burma superseding the earlier work of Sir Arthur Phayre. This is the *History of Burma from the earliest times to the 10th March 1824, the beginning of the English conquest* by G. E. Harvey (London 1925). The author while treating the early history of Burma in a very summary fashion has sought to utilise available materials including the highly valuable indigenous chronicles which, as he says, are without a parallel in the main-land of Indo-China.

Siam

Siam or, as it is now called, Thailand was ruled before the complete establishment of Tai sovereignty in the thirteenth century by peoples of diverse stocks, the Mons in Central and Northern Siam, the Khmers in North-East Siam and the Śrīvijaya kings in the Peninsula. In a country so diversified it was no wonder that there arose different schools and styles of art but all of these were directly or indirectly saturated with Indian influences.

The beginnings of the State organisation of archæological research go back in Siam only to the third decade of this century though the Vajirañāna National Library (so called after the name of the then reigning king before his accession) had been established at Bangkok as far back as 1905. It was in 1924 that King Rama VI founded the Archæological Service. His successor King Prajadhipok established at Bangkok in 1926 the Royal Institute (*Rājapāṇḍiyasabhā*) of Literature, Archæology and Fine Arts, the Literary Section having charge of the National Library and the Archæological Section that of the Archæological Service and the Museum. In the same year he formed the National Museum at Bangkok out of the collections of King Mongut, King Chulalongkorn and Prince Damrong Mahānubhava. Other museums were started before or after this time at Lopburi, Ayudhya and other places.

To no single scholar is Siamese art as well as archæology more indebted than to the illustrious French savant George Çœdés. Appointed Librarian of the Vajirañāna National Library in 1917 and thereafter called to the office of General Secretary of the newly founded Royal Institute of Siam, he enriched almost every branch

of Siamese antiquities by his illuminating researches extending over many years. His preliminary studies of the documents bearing on the Sukhodaya dynasty (*Documents sur le Dynastie de Sukhodaya, B. E. F. E. O.* XVII, 1917) were followed by a more intensive investigation of the beginnings of the same dynasty (*Les origines de le Dynastie de Sukhodaya, J. A.*, 1920). Of the greatest value as a source-book of the history of Siam was his publication of the text and translation of the inscriptions extending from the Indo-Mon kingdom of Dvāravatī down to the Tai kingdom of Sukhodaya (or Suk'ot'ai). This work bearing the title *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam* was published in two parts, Part I (Bangkok 1924) dealing with the inscriptions (Pali and Thai) of the Sukhodaya kingdom (13th-16th centuries), and Part II (Bangkok 1929) dealing with the inscriptions (Pali and Mon) of the Dvāravatī kingdom (7th-8th centuries), the inscriptions (Sanskrit and Khmer) of the Śrīvijaya kingdom (8th-12th centuries), the inscriptions (Pali and Mon) of the kingdom of Haripuñjaya (12th-13th centuries). It contained, among other things, masterly summary of the archæological evidence relating to the early history of Siam. Of equally fundamental importance was Çœdés' publication (with a French translation and a learned introduction) of two Pali chronicles from the Mss. collection of the National Library of Bangkok (*Documents sur l'Histoire Politique et Religieuse du Laos Occidental, B.E. F.E.O.* XXV, 1925). These works are the Jinakālamālinī ("*Garland of the times of Buddha*") of the Monk Ratnapañña (dated about the beginning of the 15th century) and the Chāmadevīvaṁsa ("*Chronicles of Chāma Devi*") of the monk Bodhiraśmi (written in 1516 A. D.), and they rank as first-rate authorities for the history of Yonakaraṭṭha (Western or Siamese Laos) from the beginning down to their own times. To the above mentioned work he has added a number of valuable Appendices including *A List of chronicles and other documents relating to the history of Siamese Laos preserved in the National Library at Bangkok, A List of inscriptions found in the two provinces of Siamese Laos, The text and translation of the Mon Inscriptions of Lopburi and Lampun* and so forth.

The study of art and architecture in Siam has equally benefited by the scholarly activities of Çœdés. In *J. S. S.* XXI (1928) he identified certain bronze Buddha images excavated from the ancient site of Pong Tuk in the previous year as belonging to the Amarāvatī (2nd century) and Gupta (6th century) styles. In his important work (in French) called *The archaeological collections of the National*

Museum at Bangkok (*Ars Asiatica* XII, 1928) containing 40 Plates illustrating the art of Siam he distinguished its four schools classified under the heads '*Art of Dvāravatī,*' '*Art of Śrīvijaya,*' '*Art of Lopburi,* and *Tai* (*or Siamese*) *art* subdivided into the *schools of Xiensen, Sukhodaya, Utong* and *Ayudhya.* Explaining the characteristics of these schools, he pointed out that the art of Dvāravatī (Central Siam) was based on Gupta models and was the intermediary through which Indian art influenced the 'primitive' or 'pre-Khmer' art of Cambodia. He also held that the school of Lopburi represented a provincial Khmer art while the school of Xiensen was derived from Pāla art by way of Burma. In this connection he did a distinct service by discarding the title 'Graeco-Khmer' applied by some scholars to the art of Dvāravatī. At a later date Çœdès identified (*E'tudes d' Orientalisme Lnossier,* pp. 159-64) certain sculptures excavated from the ancient city of Srideb as illustrating the link between the Gupta and Khmer art.

While the main credit for investigating the archaeology of Siam belongs to Çœdès, other scholars have made important contributions to its study during the last twenty years. To the Siamese scholar, prince Damrong, we owe *A History of Siam prior to the Ayudhya period,* which was translated into English by (Sir) J. Crosby in *J. S. S.* XIII (Bangkok 1920). In this work new light was sought to be thrown upon the history of the Early Tai kingdoms. Prince Damrong also wrote (in Siamese) *A History of Buddhist Stūpas in Siam* (Bangkok 1926), while he published in the *Jubilee Volume of the Siam Society* (Bangkok 1937) a paper on the *Evolution of Siamese Art.* About this time A. Salmony produced his work *The Sculpture of Siam* (London 1925 ; French edition, Paris 1925) which, written from an aesthetic standpoint, has been rightly condemned (Cf. Finot and Goloubev's criticism in *BEFEO* 1927) for its grievous errors of history and chronology. In *BEFEO* (1931) J. Y. Claeys published an important paper (in French) called *The Archaeology of Siam* where he described a large number of monuments with critical remarks on the history and chronology, architecture and sculpture, of Siam. The art of Siam has been discussed by Pierre Dupont in his paper *The Art of Dvāravatī and Khmer Art* (*RAA.* ix. 1935) where he points out that the standing Buddha images of the Bayon period represent the survival of the Dvāravatī art of Siam and Laos. Coming to epigraphy, we may mention the publication by R. Halliday of a list of seven Mon inscriptions of Siam with translation and notes (*BEFEO*, xxx,

1930; also *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, xxii). In this connection reference may be made to E. Seidenfaden's paper (in French) called *Complement to the Inventory of the Monuments of Cambodia* from the four provinces of Eastern Siam (*BEFEO*, xxiii, 1923) supplementing Lunet de Lajonquiere's *Descriptive Inventory of the Monuments of Cambodia* (1902–12) to be described below.

Another scholar who has enriched the art and archæology of Siam in recent time is Reginald Le May, for some time Economic Adviser to the Siamese Government. In his work *The Coinage of Siam* (Bangkok 1932), while describing the coin-types of the Ayudhya and other dynasties, he pointed out that the Tai were the first people in the Far East to introduce a standardised Silver currency. The ceramic art of Siam, which is indebted to the famous Sung pottery of China, was studied by him in his paper *The ceramic wares of North-Central Siam* (*Burlington Magazine*, London 1933). In his *Buddhist art in Siam* (Cambridge 1938) he has published the first comprehensive account of the rise and development of sculpture and architecture in Siam from the earliest times to the sixteenth century. Based chiefly on the researches of Çœdés, to whom the author freely acknowledges his indebtedness, this work distinguished no less than nine different schools: (1) Pure Indian upto the 5th century, (2) Mon–Indian (Gupta), 5th to 10th centuries, (3) Hindu–Javanese, 7th to 12th centuries, (4) Khmer and Mon-Khmer transition, 10th to 13th centuries, (5) Tai (Chiengsen), 11th to 14th centuries, (6) Tai (Suk'ot'ai), 13th to 14th centuries, (7) Khmer–Tai transition (U-T'ong), 13th to 14th centuries, (8) Tai (Lopburi), 15th to 17th centuries, (9) Tai (Ayudhya), 14th to 17th centuries. To these has to be added a tenth viz. the school of Funan. The influence bearing on all these schools, however, has been directly or indirectly all Indian. Le May's views have been endorsed by Çœdés who points out *J. R. A. S.* 1939) that the former has rightly prolonged the Mon–Indian school to the eleventh century A. D. and has emphasized the influence of the Pāla art upon the Chiengsen school.

Among recent explorers of ancient sites in Siam we may mention H. G. Quaritch Wales. As early as 1931 he had published his work, *Siamese State ceremonies, their history and function*, where he showed that these ceremonies were a curious blend of Brahmanical and Buddhist elements and might be traced back to India through literary sources. As leader of the first Research expedition (1934) of the newly started *Greater India Research Committee* in London, he explored, with the aid of a generous grant of H. H. the Gaekwar of

Baroda, the Siamese portion of the Malay Peninsula. His discoveries including those of Brahmanical images at Takuapa (Ptolemy's *Takkola*) on the west coast and at Caiya on the east coast led him to confirm R. C. Majumdar's view relating to the location of the seat of the Śailendra dynasty in Malay. What is more, he held Caiya to be the original capital of this dynasty. He further suggested, as against Parmentier and Bosch, that the region around the Bay of Bandon drawing its original inspiration from Indian influences was the cradle of the Far Eastern civilisation. (See H. G. Quaritch Wales, *A Newly-explored Route of Ancient Indian Cultural Expansion,* IAL. ix. 1935). In his second expedition (1935-36) the same intrepid explorer visited the ancient site of Pong Tuk excavated by the Archaeological Department of Siam in 1927, and he was rewarded with the discovery of a ruined brick *stūpa* and *vihāra* of the Dvāravatī period. He explored the ancient city of Sridev in Southern Siam which had been discovered by Prince Damrong in 1905 and had produced a few sculptures identified by Çœdès as belonging to the Gupta school. Quaritch Wales's discoveries at this site consisted of the plan of the deserted city recalling that of Ancient Indian towns, of a ruined brick tower on a pyramidical base resembling the 5th-6th century Gupta brick temple at Bhitargaon in the Cawnpore district, of Vaiṣṇava sculptures recalling the figures on the Gupta temple at Bhumara and of stone inscriptions in South Indian characters of the early 6th century. (See H. G. Quaritch Wales, *The Exploration of Śrī Deva*, A. B. I. A., X).

A fresh field for exploration of Siamese sites has been opened by the enterprise of the French School of the Far East in our own times. A convention signed with the Siamese Government in 1937 has given the School the right of archaeological exploration in the country for a minimum period of five years. The first expedition led by Pierre Dupont in 1939 succeeded in excavating on an ancient site near Nakon Pathom the remains of a *stūpa* recalling the most archaic models of South India and Ceylon along with other antiquities belonging to the art of Dvāravatī (7th-8th centuries). At Nakon Pathom were also discovered votive tablets with the Buddhist creed in Pallava characters analogous to those of the oldest Indo-Chinese inscriptions of the 5th century A. D. (See *B. E. F. E. O.* XXXIX, 1939 for a full account illustrated with plans).

In the field of general history we have to mention the important work of W. A. R. Wood, *A History of Siam from the earliest times to the year A. D. 1781* (London, 1926). While it has the merit of giv-

ing the first connected account of the country based on first-hand sources, it unfortunately fails to do justice to the period covered by the Hinduised pre-Tai States of Siam. It brings down the history of Siam to the date of accession of Rāma I, the founder of the present dynasty.

From a general review of the above accounts it will appear that an enormous influence was exercised by Indian civilisation upon Siam (or Thailand) during the past centuries. Not to speak of the bronze Buddha images directly imported from Amarāvatī by Indian immigrants probably in the 3rd century A. D., the Mons who were the dominant people in Central Siam (c. 500–1000 A. D.) with Dvāravatī as their centre were devout Buddhists of the Hīnayāna school. The Buddha images of this period have been shown to bear close affinities to those of Sarnath and the Ajanta caves. The Mons have left behind inscriptions not only in their own language but also in Sanskrit and Pali. At a later period North Siam with Haripuñjaya (Lampun) as its centre was colonised by the Mons or Mon-speaking races. The colonists also were fervent Buddhists and they covered their cities with beautiful temples and *stūpas.* In Siamese Malay under the rule of the Hinduised Śrīvijaya and Śailendra dynasties Jaya and Nagara Srithammarat (Ligor) on the east coast and Takuapa on the west coast were important centres of Indian culture. On these sites have been discovered Mahāyāna Buddhist bronze images derived from Pāla art and Brahmanical stone sculptures apparently based on Pallava art. It seems that there was at this period a fresh wave of immigration from East India. Between the 3rd and 6th centuries Central Siam (with its centre at Lopburi) as well as North-East Siam was included in the kingdom of Funan. The kingdom of Cambodia extended its sovereignty over the same region between the 10th and the 13th centuries. During this long period Brahmanism as well as Buddhism was in high favour. The Gupta art (according to Çœdés) or the Pallava, Cālukya and Pāṇḍya art (according to Le May) furnished the model for the Funan images. Khmer sculpture forms a distinctive type which is found in its pure form in the North-East and is mingled with Mon elements in Central Siam. From the 13th century onwards Siam has been ruled by the Tai, a Mongoloid people from the Chinese province of Yunnan. The various Tai dynasties which were in power with their capitals at Chiengmai, Chiengsen, U-T'ong, Ayudhya and Bangkok were from time to time in contact with the great Empire of China. Nevertheless the civilisation of the Tai

from first to last is almost completely dominated by Indian and allied cultures. The oldest Tai (Chiengsen) school of Siam has been proved to derive its new type of Buddha image from Pāla art through the intermediary of Pagan. With the Suk'ot'ai school began a new Buddha type based largely on Chiengsen but also partaking for the first time of Sinhalese influence. From this time Sinhalese Buddhism began to exercise considerable influence upon the religion and art of Siam. Nevertheless we find that at the beginning of the Ayudhya period in the 16th century, there was erected a considerable number of Brahmanical images testifying to the continuation of the Indian influence. (For references, see Le May, *Buddhist Art in Siam*, pp. 149–150).

Cambodia

Cambodia, the land of the Khmers (kinsmen by language if not by race of the Mons of Burma and the Khasis and Mundas of North India), now forms a protectorate of French Indo-China. For nearly 900 years (c. 550–1450 A. D.) it was ruled by a succession of Hindu (or Hinduised) dynasties under whom it not only became one of the leading powers of South-Eastern Asia but also developed an advanced civilisation testified to by its legacy of magnificent works of art and of Sanskrit inscriptions of a high quality. And yet Kambujadeśa, to give it its Ancient Sanskrit name, was not the oldest Indian colony in that part of the country. It was itself established on the ruins of another Indian kingdom known to the Chinese writers as Funan. Traditionally said to have been founded (about the 1st century A. D.) by the Brahman Kauṇḍiṇya and completely Indianised by another person of the same name c. 400 A. D., it witnessed a full blossoming of Hindu culture before its disappearance about the end of the sixth century.

By the middle of the second decade of the present century the foundation of Cambodian studies had been well and firmly laid by a band of French scholars. The decipherment of the first Sanskrit inscriptions from Cambodia in 1879 by the renowned Dutch scholar Hendrik Kern, the founder of Cambodian epigraphy, was followed by the publication of the text and translation of a large number of similar inscriptions by Auguste Barth and Abel Bergaigne Their famous work known as *Inscriptions Sanskrites du Cambodge et du Campā* was published in volume XX, Part I, of the *Notices and Extracts of the Mss. of the Bibliotheque Nationale and other libraries* (Fasc. 1, Paris 1885 ; Fasc. 2, Paris 1893). The foundation of the renowned French School of the Far East (at first called by the

modest name of *Archaeological Mission of Indo-China*) in 1898 was the signal for a great outburst of scholarly activities. To the famous *Bulletin* of this School (started in 1901) its members have contributed numerous papers which have illumined the dark corners of the art, archaeology and general history, not only of French Indo-China but also of adjoining lands. The activities of this School were directed at first towards a systematic survey of antiquities. In 1901 Lunet de Lajonquière produced his *Archaeological Atlas of Indo-China* (in French) tracing the monuments of Champa and Cambodia. Afterwards he published (in French) his great *Descriptive Inventory of the Monuments of Cambodia* forming the First Part of his projected *Archaeological Inventory of Indo-China*. This work consisted of three volumes (Paris 1902, 1907, 1912) containing, along with useful general introductions, short notices of all monuments and inscriptions in the different provinces of Cambodia, Siam and Cochin China. From 1907 when Siam ceded to France the provinces of Battambag and Siemrap, the School began to devote its energy to the exploration and conservation of the world-famed Angkor group of monuments included in the cession. Meanwhile E. Aymonier published his comprehensive work *Le Cambodge* in three volumes (Paris 1900–1904). The volums, dealing successively with the present kingdom of Cambodia, the Siamese provinces and the Angkor group, contained a detailed description of the land and the people, the laws and institutions, the monuments and inscriptions and, last but not the least, the geographical regions. With this may be mentioned the great Bibliography of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula (*Bibliotheca Indo-Sinica*) of H. Cordier, which was published by the French School of the Far East in four volumes (1912, 1913, 1914). Volume I deals with Burma, Assam, Siam and Laos, Volume II with the Malay Peninsula, Volumes III and IV with French Indo-China. (The Index of the whole work from the pen of M. A. Roland-Cabaton had to wait for publication till 1932). Work of a different kind was done by Pelliot who pushed back the history of Hindu civilisation in French Indo-China by recovering from the invaluable Chinese literary references the forgotten record of the Kingdom of Funan (*B. E. F. E. O.* III, 1903). In *B. E. F. E. O.* XVI, Parmentier published a series of six maps illustrating the sites of the stone inscriptions and the gradual expansion of the Khmer dominion.

The remarkable advance that has been achieved in recent years in our knowledge of Cambodian history and antiquities is almost

entirely due to the activities of the French School and above all of its two illustrious Directors, Louis Finot and George Çœdés and its architect, Henri Parmentier. To begin with archaeology, there appeared under the auspices of this School a volume (in French) called *General lists of inscriptions and monuments of Champa and Cambodia* (2nd ed. 1923). The first part dealing with inscriptions was the work of Çœdés and the second describing the monuments was written by Parmentier. In *BEFEO*, xxv (1925), xxviii (1928) and xxix (1929), Finot published a number of important inscriptions (especially from Angkor) discovered since 1923. The School took the lead in carrying into effect a scheme of *Corpus* of Cambodian inscriptions first projected by Georges Maspero. Between 1926 and 1928 there appeared four volumes (Vols. I–III, Paris 1926–27 , Vol. IV, Paris 1929) of *Inscriptions of Cambodia* containing the *facsimiles* of inscriptions not comprised in the work of Barth and Bergaigne or else occurring there without *facsimiles.* A fifth volume with the usual *facsimiles* of the inscriptions was published by Finot in 1931. The sixth and last volume of the *Corpus* containing forty-four plates of inscriptions discovered since 1929 was produced by Çœdés in 1937. To this last the author added the text and translation of the inscriptions concerned under the title *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (Vol. I. Hanoi 1937). Meanwhile Çœdés had deciphered (*BEFEO*, xxxi, 1931) two inscriptions of Funan, one mentioning the installation of the foot-prints of God Viṣṇu by king Guṇavarman (first half of 5th century) and the other referring to Kings Jayavarman and Rudravarman (first half of 6th century). The same scholar has since identified (*JGIS* iv, 1937) a newly discovered epigraph as referring to this Jayavarman who reigned at the end of the 5th century. The inscription which begins with invocation to god Viṣṇu records the foundation of a hermitage by Jayavarman's principal queen called Kulaprabhāvatī.

Coming to monuments and works of art, it could be a matter of reproach as late as 1921 that, while disproportionate attention had been given to the epigraphy and philology of Cambodia, its art and archaeology had never been methodically studied (see Groslier, *Arts et Archéologie Khmers*, I, 1921–22, Fasc. I, Introduction, pp. 7 ff.). During the last twenty-five years the School has pursued a ceaseless and most successful campaign of archaeological exploration and research. To take a few examples, we may begin by referring to Henri Marchal's discovery at Roluos (identified by Çœdés with Hariharālaya, a capital of Jayavarman II) of the remains of a

temple belonging to the end of the 9th century. Other excavations have recently been carried out at Phnom Kulen probably identical with Mahendraparvata, another capital of Jayavarman II (latter half of 8th century–854 A. D.). These discoveries have proved (Philippe Stern, *La transition de l'art préangkoréen a l'art angkoréen et Jayavarman II* in *E'tudes d'Orientalisme Linossier*, pp. 507–524) the architectural style of Jayavarman II to be intermediary between the primitive and the classical Khmer art. In the Angkor group of monuments themselves Çoedès has recently discovered a pre-Angkor monument. Remains of three brick towers having been brought to light by Marchal in 1930, Çoedès was able to prove the identity of the central tower with the sanctuary of Kuṭīśvara of the reign of Jayavarman II mentioned in the inscriptions. At Bantay Srei (Īśvarapura), 12 miles north-east of Angkor, was discoverd in 1914 a Śivite temple which has been recently proved (Çoedès, *BEFEO*, 1929) to have wholly belonged to the reign of Jayavarman V (10th century). The temple which consists of three sanctuaries and two libraries adorned with exquisite reliefs representing Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava mythology has formed the subject of a magnificent monograph called *Le Temple d'Īśvarapura* (*Bantay Srei*), Paris 1926. In this volume which forms the first of the series of *Memoirs of the French School of the Far East*, the monuments have been described by Parmentier, the images by Goloubev, the inscriptions and general history by Finot.

By far the most important and fruitful of these explorations and researches have centred around the wonderful group of monuments at Angkor which was the capital of the Cambodian kingdom for more than five centuries. To the assiduous care of Henri Marchal, the conservator of the group of Angkor monuments since 1916, is due a good deal of valuable work in the way of exploration, conservation and popularisation of these monuments. The first complete photographic inventory of the great monument of Angkor Vat was published as the second Memoir of the French School of the Far East in a series of magnificent volumes (in French) called *The Temple of Angkor Vat.* Part I of this monumental work bearing the title *The Architecture of the Monument* (Paris and Brussels 1929) was illustrated with 151 Plates and 2 Plans with a Preface by Finot tracing the history of the temple from its foundation to its restoration under French auspices in recent times. Part II called *The Ornamental Sculptures of the Temple* (2 Vols., Paris and Brussels 1930) was brought out with similar illustrations with an intro-

duction by Goloubev. Part III called *The Gallery of Bas-reliefs* (3 Vols., Paris 1932) was illustrated with 64 + 146 + 112 Plates and 4+5+3 Plans with a Preface by Çœdés. Among the subjects of these world-famed bas-reliefs are legends of Viṣṇu and his two incarnations of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, the Hindu Heavens and Hells and the like. Altogether these volumes form a worthy record of the imperishable monument which has been rightly reckoned among the greatest monuments of the world because of the amplitude of its architecture and the richness of its sculpture. Built as a Viṣṇuite temple between the years 1115 and 1180 A. D. by Sūryavarman II and his nephew and successor Dharaṇīndravarman II (see Çœdés, *JA*. 1920, p. 96), Angkor Vat underwent strange vicissitudes of fortune, for it was appropriated by Jayavarman VII (1181-1201) to the cult of Mahāyāna Buddhism and was afterwards annexed to Hīnayāna Buddhism. Passing to the famous city of Angkor Thom (north of Angkor Vat) with its well-known group of monuments like the Bayon and the Bapuon, we may first mention that the Bapuon has been recently identified by Çœdés (*BEFEO*, xxxi) with Svarṇādri which the inscriptions record to have been built by Udayādityavarman II in the second half of the 11th century. Of fundamental importance is the discovery due to the recent researches of Çœdés and Goloubev that the present city of Angkor Thom with its group of monuments was not built by Yaśovarman I at the close of the 9th century (as was formerly supposed), nor by Sūryavarman I (1002-1049) as was later suggested by Philippe Stern (*Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'evolution de l'Art Khmer*, Paris 1927), but was the work of Jayavarman VII at the close of the 12th century A. D. The excavations carried out during 1931-32 and 1933-34 under the guidance of Goloubev supplemented by aerial surveys of the site have since revealed the plan of the original city of Yaśovarman I which was a rectangle like its successor but was larger in size. At the exact centre of the rectangle representing the older city stands the Śivite temple of Phnom Bakheng, which Goloubev has shown to be identical with the Central Mount mentioned in Yaśovarman I's inscriptions to have been built by that monarch for housing the tutelary deity of the realm. (See Çœdés, *BEFEO*, xxviii ; Goloubev, *BEFEO*, xxxiii ; *ibid.* xxxiv ; *JA*. ccxxvi, 1935). So far as the Bayon (formerly identified with the Central Mount) is concerned, excavations carried out in 1933-34 in the pit of the central tower revealed fragments of a stone statue which have since been restored to form a large-sized Buddha image seated on a pedestal beneath the canopy of a polycephalous Nāga. This statue,

which has been reckoned among the finest sculptures of Cambodia found so far, has been identified by Çœdés as the image of Jayavarman VII deified as Buddha. To the same scholar is due the suggestion that the large number of four-faced stone towers for which the Bayon is so famous represent colossal portraits of the great Emperor in the guise of Avalokiteśvara, the All-merciful deity of the Mahāyānist pantheon. Quite recently Çœdés has suggested in the light of fresh excavations that the central block of the Bayon was built by Jayavarman VII as a central temple of his restored capital with his own statue in the form of a Buddha. A statue of Vajradhara at Bantei Chmar has been identified by Goloubev, *JISOA*, v. 1937, as a portrait of Jayavarman VII, " the living Buddha."

The important discoveries connected with Angkor Thom and its great monument of the Bayon have resulted in a complete reconstruction of the chronology of Khmer art. The new chronology may be stated as follows: (1) pre-Angkor style, 6th-9th centuries, (2) style of Lolei and Koh Ker, 10th century, (3) styles of Bantei Srei, Bapuon, Angkor Vat, 11th-12th centuries, (4) Bayon, 12th-13 centuries.

We have described the remarkable progress that the French School has achieved in the way of archæological exploration and research. This work has been accompanied by that of conservation of the monuments concerned. A new era was opened in this line by the journey of Marchal to Indonesia in 1930 with the object of studying the Dutch methods of reconstruction (*Anastylose*) which had been so successfully applied to Chaṇḍi Kalasan and other monuments of Java. The happy results of Marchal's expedition were seen in his reconstruction on similar lines of the southern sanctuary of the temple at Bantay Srei belonging to the 10th century (For a popular account of this reconstruction see *IAL*, vii, 1933).

The growth of museums has kept pace with the march of archaeological exploration and research sketched above. Not to speak of the fine collections at Louis Finot Museum (with its separate Cham and Khmer sections) at Hanoi, the Henry Parmentier Museum at Tourane (especially rich in Cham antiquities), the Blanchard de la Brosse Museum at Saigon (created as late as 1929 and containing separate sections on art, archæology and ethnography), we may mention the Albert Sarraut Museum at Phnom Penh (founded in 1919) which has been described as " the National Museum of Khmer art from the earliest to the most recent times ". The important collec-

tions of these museums have been made available for study and research by the publication of adequate and well-illustrated catalogues enriched with Introductions containing classifications of styles. To confine ourselves to those dealing with Cambodian antiquities, we may mention the catalogues of the Phnom Nenh Museum by Goloubev (*Ars Asiatica*, xvi 1931) and of the Louis Finot Museum at Hanoi by Marchal (1939). Reference may also be made to the catalogue of Indo-Chinese collections at the Musée Guimet (Paris, 1934) by P. Dupont and others.

Turning to the critical studies of Cambodian art and archaeology, we have to record continuous progress during the last twenty years. A great impetus was given to these studies by the appearance of the valuable Review *Arts et Archéologies Khmers* under the able editorship of George Groslier. The successive numbers of this Journal for the years 1921–24 contain, along with the fine illustrations of the monuments and their sculptures, weighty contributions on such topics as the temples of Ta Prohm and Prah Vihear, the Rāma legend on the temple of Angkor Vat, the bronzes and ceramics of Ancient Cambodia and the evolution of Cambodian art. In his work *La Sculpture Khmère ancienne* (Paris 1925), Groslier propounded a new theory of the origin and evolution of Khmer art which, however, has failed to command acceptance. According to his view, Kambuja art began in the 1st–7th centuries A. D. and its remnants are monuments of purely Indian character. Cambodian art properly so called, which has no connection with the art of the first period, began only in the 8th–9th centuries A. D. The first adequate study of Khmer bronzes with reference to their date and origin, their iconography and comparison with Siamese, Javanese and Indian bronzes, was given by Çœdès in his finely illustrated work *Bronzes Khmers* (*Ars Asiatica* Vol. V, 1923). The specimens were selected from public and private collections at Bangkok as well as from the collections at the royal palace at Phnom Benh and the museums of Cambodia and the French School at Hanoi. In his German work called *Old-Javanese Bronzes from the Ethnographic Collection of the Natural History Museum at Vienna* (Wien 1925) Heine-Geldern described the character and quality of the Javanese Bronzes and their relation to the Indian and Wayang types. A brief account of Cambodian architecture and sculpture was given by A. K. Coomaraswamy in his well-known work *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (London 1927). By far the most important works on Khmer art that have appeared in recent times are those of Parmentier

(*L'art Khmer primitif*, 2 vols., Paris 1927; *Complement à l'art Khmer primitif*, *BEFEO*, 1936; *L'art Khmer classique*, Paris 1939). In these works we get a masterly and well-illustrated account of all the known Khmer monuments together with general characteristics of their style and valuable discussions on the relations between Khmer art and the related arts of Champa, Java and India. In his article *The History of Khmer Architecture* (*Eastern Art*, 1931) Parmentier gave a detailed analysis of the imported Indian architecture of Funan, of the architecture, sculpture and minor arts of the Early Khmer period and of the architecture of the classical period. In the same context he distinguished three chronological divisions of Khmer architecture, viz. Early Khmer (6th–8th centuries), Classical (9th–15th centuries) with five subdivisions and Modern (from the 15th century onwards). Intensive studies in the evolution of the Khmer pilaster and pediment as well as of the *Makara* arch have been recently carried out by Mme. Gilberte de Coral Rémusat (*Annales d'Extrême-Orient*, Paris 1935; *Revue des Arts Asiatiques*, ix. 1935; *BEFEO* 1936). A type of temple called *nandika* said to have been built by Indravarman I (9th century) in on of his recently discovered inscriptions has been identified and described in the light of references in the Indian *Śilpaśāstras* by U. N. Ghoshal (*JGIS*. vii. No. 2, July 1940).

A fundamental question discussed by Parmentier in recent times in connexion with his studies on Khmer art is its relation to Indian art. In a paper on *The common origin of Hindu architecture in India and the Far East* contributed originally (in French) to the *E'tudes Asiatiques* (*Ibid.* ii, Paris 1925) and afterwards translated into English in the *Rūpam* (Calcutta 1929). Parmentier concluded from an exhaustive analysis that the origin of all forms of Indian architecture is to be found in the lost model of the ancient Buddhist Saṅghārāma of wooden construction, a type which spreading outwards with the progress of Buddhism was developed independently in each country according to its local conditions. This conclusion was re-asserted by the author in his later works (Cf. *L'art Khmer primitif*, Vol. I, p. 349). In her paper on the common origin of the lintels of Pallava India and the pre-Angkorian Khmer lintels (*RAA*. viii 1934) Mme. G. de Coral Rémusat has been driven to the same conclusion by an exhaustive comparison of Khmer and Pallava lintels. On the other hand, Reginald Le May (*Buddhist Art in Siam*) has recently drawn pointed attention to the close affinity

between the early Khmer architecture and that of the early mediaeval temples of Kharod and Sirpur in the Central Provinces of India. Çœdès has similarly recalled (*JRAS.* 1939) the astonishing parallelism between the Bhitargaon temple of the Early Gupta period and certain temple-towers of the pre-Angkor period.

Another important question discussed in recent times, which is of great interest for the student of Indian culture is the symbolism of the Cambodian monuments. Referring to the Angkor group, Jean Przyluski has suggested that the square design and the central temple characteristic of such monuments is the architectural representation of the universe according to Indian and Indo-Chinese ideas of town-planning. Regarding the other characteristics of these monuments, P.Mus has held (*JAL.* 1937) that the giants' bridges at Angkor, generally interpreted as illustrating the churning of the ocean, in reality stand for the rainbow which according to Indian traditions is a link between the world of man and of gods which is materialised on earth by the royal city, while the four-faced stone towers for which the Bayon is so famous are the four-faced images of the God Avalokiteśvara. According to the same scholar (*JAL.* xi 1937), the Bayon is both a portrait of its builder Jayavarman VII and a literal realisation in stone of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, " The Bible of Sanskrit Buddhism." The symbolism of Angkor Vat has been the subject of some remarkable controversy in recent times. While Przyluski (*Festschrift Winternitz*, pp. 326-332; *JISOA.* V. 1937, pp. 131-44) held that it was the funerary monument of its builder Jayavarman VII, Çœdès (*BEFEO* XXXIII.) declared that it was neither a temple nor a tomb, but a funerary temple, thus denying its unique character and bringing it into line with the general body of Khmer monuments.

In the branch of Cambodian iconography we may mention the comprehensive paper (in French) by Finot called *Lokeśvara in Indo-China* (*E'tudes Asiatiques*, I. 1925). Some supplementary notes have been added by U. N. Ghoshal (*Note on a type of Lokeśvara in Cambodge*, *JGIS.* v. January 1938; *Some Indian parallels of Lokeśvara types in Indo-China*, *Ibid.* July 1938). The iconography of the Khmer crowned Buddha has been discussed by P. Mus (*BEFEO.* xxviii) while Bosch has contributed (*BEFEO.* xxxi) a valuable monograph on the *Liṅgodbhavamūrti* of Śiva in Indo-China.

Coming to the general history of Cambodia and its civilisation, we have to mention the work of E. Aymonier, *Histoire de l'Ancien*

Cambodge, (Strassburg 1920) bringing up-to-date his comprehensive volume *Le Cambodge* already mentioned. An ambitious work illustrating Cambodian life and culture onwards from the 1st century of the Christian era in the light of the extant monuments and other antiquities was published by E. Groslier (*Recherches sur les Cambodgiens*, Paris 1921). It consists of two Parts, Part I dealing with writing, habitations, commerce, dress and ornaments and the like, while Part II describes the monuments with their sculptures. To an Indian scholar, Bijan Raj Chatterji, we owe a popular monograph (*Indian Cultural Influences in Cambodia*, Calcutta 1928) based on the researches of French scholars. It traces the political history of Cambodia from the earliest times and concludes with interesting notices of Indian influences upon its civilisation. In *BEFEO* 1929 Çœdés has presented new data bearing on the chronology and genealogy of the dynasty of kings from Jayavarman VI to Jayavarman VII. A work of a different kind is the *Bibliographie de l'Indo-Chine Francaise* (1913–26) Hanoi 1929, and *Ibid* (1927-29) Hanoi 1932 forming the supplement to the *Bibliothica Sinica* of Henri Cordier already mentioned.

In the above pages we have recorded the achievements of the French school in the way of recovery of the lost culture of Cambodia. The School has also sought to introduce something like a cultural renaissance in the lands under its jurisdiction. To its stimulus and continued support we owe the foundation and maintenance not only of the Buddhist Institute at Saigon but also of the Royal Libraries of ·Laos. and Cambodia started respectively in 1915 and 1925 at their present capitals Luang Prabang and Phnom Penh. More recently it has started a Pali School at Phnom Penh which by its publication of a series of canonical texts has led to a renaissance of Pali studies among the people. Mention may be made in the present place of the various publications in which the French School has sought from time to time to communicate its activities. In 1917 Senart presented his report on the activities of the School to the famous *Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres* in Paris. His example was followed by H. Cordier who submitted two Reports covering the period from 1918 to 1920, by L. Finot who presented his Report for the years 1920 to 1926 and by A. Foucher who did the same for the period 1926 to 1930. Meanwhile Finot published (*BEFEO*, 1921) a complete summary of the activities of the School from its origin to 1920. The School, which celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary by publishing two volumes of *E'tudes*

Asiatiques in 1925, started a quarterly series of chronicles (*Cahiers*) in 1934.

A general survey of pre-Khmer and Khmer culture such as we obtain from the above records reveals the immense hold obtained by Indian civilisation upon it during the whole course of its history. In the oldest times Funan with its capital at Vyādhapura had its Indian dynasty tracing descent from the Brahman Kauṇḍinya and including Guṇavarman (a patron of Vaiṣṇavism), Jayavarman and Rudravarman (probably a Buddhist). Śaivism including the worship of a perpetual *liṅga* was the predominant religion. The Kambuja kings of the late sixth and seventh centuries, who delivered Cambodia from the yoke of Funan, claimed descent from the Ṛṣi Kambu. How deeply rooted was the Hindu influence at this time will appear from the fact that the Brahman Vidyāviśeṣa, a high official of King Īśānavarman, is credited with a sound knowledge of Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya and Buddhism. Jayavarman II who unified the country under his rule in the early part of the ninth century introduced a Yāntrik form of Śaivism centering around a *liṅga* (*Jagat ta Raja*) which became the tutelary deity of the kingdom. Yaśovarman I (889–910 A. D.), the builder of the first city of Angkor including the Śivite temple of Phnom Bakheng, was the author of a number of Sanskrit inscriptions written in the native Cambodian alphabet of South Indian origin and in a North Indian script, as well as of other inscriptions in the same North Indian script which indicate an extensive knowledge of Sanskrit literature. Sūryavarman II (1112–1152 A. D.) built the wonderful Viṣṇvite temple at Angkor Vat enshrining probably an image of the king himself in the guise of Viṣṇu. Jayavarman VII, the last of the Grand Monarchs of Cambodia, has now been shown to have built the present city of Angkor Thom with its wonderful group of monuments including the Bayon. Throughout this period Sanskrit literature in all its branches including above all grammar and *kāvya* was studied assiduously, as is proved by the evidence of the inscriptions. Brahmanism including specially the worship of Śiva was the dominant religion. The Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Harivaṁśa furnished the themes of numerous bas-reliefs of the Cambodian temples. Among the most frequently illustrated scenes are the Churning of the ocean, the war between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas, Kṛṣṇa holding aloft the mountain Govardhana, Viṣṇu reposing in slumber upon the serpent Ananta with Brahmā seated on a lotus springing from his navel, and so forth.

Champa

The country of Champa, corresponding to the Annam province of French Indo-China without its northern districts, was inhabited from ancient times by the Chams, a people of Malay-Polynesian stock. Ruled by Hindu dynasties for nearly twelve centuries from the second or third century onwards, it became a great centre of Sanskrit culture testified to at present by its numbers of Sanskrit inscriptions. During this time the chief cities (Champāpurī, Indrapura, Vijaya, etc.,) of Champādeśa (as it was called in the inscriptions) were adorned with fine monuments dedicated to Brahmanism as well as Buddhism. And yet Champa could not vie with Cambodia or Java in the greatness of its monuments. Exposed to the attacks of its formidable adversaries, specially the Annamites in the north and the Cambodians in the west and south, who ravaged their country more than once, the people lived an agitated and precarious life allowing little leisure for development of the arts of peace. The brick constructions of the shrines have not helped to preserve them to our own times.

It is characteristic of the difference between Champa and Cambodia that while the great advance in our knowledge of Cambodian art, archaeology and general history has taken place only during the last twenty years, the study of Champa antiquities was all but completed by the middle of the second decade of this century. To begin with archaeology, we have referred above to the publication of the text and translation of the Sanskrit inscriptions of Cambodia and Champa by Barth and Bergaigne in 1893. An important collection of inscriptions in Cham was edited by Aymonier in *J. A.*, 1891. After the foundation of the French School of the Far East a large number ef new inscriptions of Champa was edited in its famous *Bulletin* by Finot (see specially Ibid II-IV) and by Huber (Ibid IX, XI, XIV). Valuable lists of inscriptions from Champa were published by Çœdés in the same journal (Ibid Vol. VIII and XV). In the early years of this century Parmentier carried out a series of important excavations on the sites of the Buddhist monasteries at Dong Duong (Indrapura) and the Brahmanical shrines at Myson and Po-Nagar. In 1909 the same scholar published the first volume of his great work on the Cham monuments (*Inventaire Descriptif dcs Monuments Chams de l'Annam* bearing the sub-title of *Descriptions of the monuments.* It

contains an exhaustive account of all known Cham monuments within and outside the country with valuable preliminary notices of their geographical environment and the general characteristics of their style. Meanwhile the valuable Chinese texts bearing on the history of Champa were brought to light by Pelliot, Maspero and Aurosseau (*BEFEO* IV, XIV). The scattered references in the Chinese and Annamite records and the evidence of Cham and Cambodian inscriptions were pieced together by Maspero in his important monograph called *The Kingdom of Champa* (*Le Royaume du Champa*, 1914) tracing the history of this kingdom from earliest times to the final conquest of the greater part of the country by the Annamites in 1471 A. D. The work that has been done in the investigation of the ancient Cham history and culture during the last twent-five years has been mostly of a supplementary character. In 1918 Parmentier completed his masterly survey of Cham monuments by publishing (in French) the second volume of his great *Descriptive Inventory* bearing the sub-title of *A study of Cham Art.* Besides giving an elaborate account of the details of Cham architecture and sculpture, it described the civilisation and state of religion revealed by the monuments, the genius of Cham arts, its origin and successive periods, its aesthetics and so forth. It was followed by another volume containing the Plates and Albums. The same scholar afterwards published (in French) his *Descriptive Catalogue of Cham Sculpture in the Tourane Museum* (*Ars Asiatica*, 1922) most of these sculptures dating from the 7th to the 10th century. In 1923 Çœdés and Parmentier published their *General Lists of Inscriptions and Monuments in Champa and Cambodge*, to which reference has been made above. Mention may be made in this connection of the important *Catalogue of Indo-Chinese* (*including Cham*) *Collections at the Musée Guimet* (in French) by Pierre Dupont and others (Paris 1934). Meanwhile important excavations were carried out by the French School at Tra Kieu long before identified (*BEFEO*, xiv) by Aurosseau with the first capital of the Cham kingdom. The reliefs of the Tra Kieu temple have since been identified by Çœdés (*BEFEO*, xxxi) as illustrating the legends of Kṛṣṇa and as described in the *Harivaṁśa* and in the Purāṇas. As regards conservation of Monuments, one of the most interesting examples in recent times has been the reconstruction by J. Y. Claeys of the principal temple-tower of Po-Nagar built in 817 A. D. (For a popular account, see J. Y. Claeys, *Po-Nagar, Recent Work of Restoration by the Ecole Francaise d'Extrême Orient,* ABIA. 1931).

Coming to general history, we have to mention R. C. Majumdar's publication of a comprehensive account of the history and culture of Champa (*Champa: Greater India Society's Publication No 1*, Lahore 1927) forming the first volume of a projected series called *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East.* This volume, while based principally upon the monumental *Le Royaume du Champa* of Maspero and *Inventaire Descriptif des monuments Cams* of Parmentier, seeks to throw new light upon some of the problems of general history and the history of art of Champa. Most interesting is the author's attempt to prove against the high authority of Parmentier his thesis that Cham architecture was derived from Cālukya and Pallava styles as illustrated by the temples of Badami, Conjeeveram and Mahabalipuram. The value of Majumdar's work has been enhanced by its including the first complete collection of inscriptions from Champa with his own translations and notes. More recently the problem of palaeography of the earliest Champa inscriptions on which hinges the question of *provenance* of the first Indian colonists has been discussed by R. C. Majumdar (*B.E.F.E.O.* 1932) and K. A. Nilkanta Sastri (*B. E. F. E. O.* 1935). In his paper *Date of the earliest Sanskrit inscription of Champa* (*J. G. I. S.* VI 1939) D. C. Sircar has suggested a late date (4th century A. D.) for the famous Vo—Chañh Roia inscription.

The researches of an Annamite scholar of the French School, based on an exhaustive study of Chinese, Annamite and European records, have recently disclosed the interesting history of the origin and progress of Buddhism in Ancient Annam. Buddhism, it appears, was probably introduced from India into Annam by the direct sea-route. Among its great missionaries were the Indian monks Mārajīvaka and Kṣudra (294 A. D.). (See Tran van Giap, *Le Bouddhisme en Annam des origines au XIIIe siécle, BEFEO* 1932). Excavations recently carried out in Annam have resulted in the discoveries of sculptures suggesting to J. Y. Claeys the Indian origin of Annam's first civilisation.

Malayasia

The vast regions comprised in the modern Malay Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago (otherwise called Indonesia or Insulinde) were inhabited from remote times by peoples of Austronesian speech. Known to Ancient Indian literature under the vague designations of *Suvarṇabhūmi* and *Suvarṇadvīpa* and to the ancient Greek, Chinese

and Arab writers under equivalent terms, they were visited by Indian merchants at least as early as the first century A. D. and were afterwards colonised by Indian settlers. 'Paloura' (or to give it its Indian name, Dantapura) in Kaliṅga was in the oldest times the great port of embarkation from India to the Far East. Specially in Java, Sumatra and Malay the Hindu civilisation took firm root, as is evidenced by the records of numerous Hindu (or Hinduised) kingdoms flourishing in those regions for at least a thousand years till they were engulfed by the advancing tide of Islam in the 15th and 16th centuries. Twice during this long period, under the great Śailendra dynasty and under the empire of Majapahit (called in Sanskrit *Vilvatikta*) the greater part of *Suvarṇadvīpa* was brought under one political control.

Java

Apparently the oldest references to the island of Java are to be found in the Rāmāyaṇa under the name of *Javadvīpa* and in Ptolemy's Geography in the form of *Iavadiou* translated as 'Barley Island.' A king called Devavarman, as appears from a Chinese literary reference, ruled the country in the first part of the 2nd century A. D. In the beginning of the 5th century Fa Hian found Brahmanism flourishing in the island. The oldest Sanskrit inscriptions found in the island mention King Pūrṇavarman son (?) of a Rājādhirāja and grandson of a Rājarṣi who ruled over Western Java in the 5th or 6th century A. D. The oldest Sanskrit inscription from Central Java written probably in the Seventh century shows this region to have been equally saturated with Brahmanical culture. Under the succeeding dynasties, as is proved by the splendid remains of architecture and sculpture dating from the eighth century and the works of the Old Javanese literature practically dating from the eleventh century, an Indo-Javanese civilisation flourished exceedingly.

The early steps towards investigation of Javanese history and culture were marked by the foundation of the *Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences* (the oldest of the learned Societies of the East) in 1778, by the first scientific exploration of the Barabudur and Prambanan monuments during the British interregnum by order of the Lt. Governor, Sir Stamford Raffles (the founder of archaeological research in Java), by the publication of Raffles's *History of Java* (1st edition, 1817) and lastly, by the issue of the first scientific study of Javanese art in 1824 by C.J.C. Reuvens, Director of the newly founded Leyden

Museum. The critical study of the extensive Indo-Javanese literature largely based upon the Sanskrit was begun by Friedrich's editions of the Vṛttasaṁcaya, the Arjunavivāha and the Bhomakāvya (1849-51) and his disquisitions on the Javanese Vedas, Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, Mahābhārata and so forth (*Proceedings of the Batavia Society*, 1849). In the seventh decade of the last century H. Kern initiated the critical study of Indonesian epigraphy by editing a number of Sanskrit inscriptions from Sumatra, Java and Borneo (*V. G.* VI), while A. B. Cohen Stuart published (in Dutch) an important collection of charters in the native Kawi language with Introduction, facsimile and transcript (Leyden 1875) and W. P. Groeneveldt wrote his valuable *Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca compiled from Chinese sources* (Batavia 1877). In the following decade local museums were started at Jogyakarta (afterwards transferred to Prambanan) and at Dieng in Central Java. The first catalogue of archaeological collection of the Museum of the *Batavia Society* was issued by Groeneveldt in 1887. As regards the study of Indo-Javanese literature, the *Kuṭāra-Mānava* (regarded as the highest authority on Law in East Java) was edited with Introduction and Dutch translation by J. B. G. Jonker (Leyden 1885), while H. H. Juynboll in 1893 published his Dutch translation of the Javanese *Mahābhārata* (*Parvans* XV-XVII) which ushered in a period of serious research on the subject. We may also refer to the important studies in the Indo-Javanese theatre by Brandes (*T. B. G.*, 1889) and by G. A. J. Hazeu (Leyden 1897). The first decade of the present century witnessed after many years of sad neglect the establishment in 1901 of the *Committee in Netherlands-India for the Archaeological Exploration in Java and Madura* (replaced by the *Archaeological Service of Netherlands-India* in 1913) with J. L. A. Brandes as its first Chairman. (For a scathing criticism of the archaeological policy of the Dutch Colonial Government see J. F. Scheltema, *Monumental Java*, London 1912). During the twelve years of its existence the Committee published a valuable series of Reports (*Rapporten*) noticing the chief antiquities of the island year after year. The Committee also started a series of works (in Dutch) called *Archaeological Explorations in Java and Madura* of which the first two volumes giving an exhaustive and. well-illustrated account of the well-known temples of Caṇḍi Jago and Caṇḍi Singhasāri were published by Brandes in 1904 and 1909 respectively. To the credit of the Committee must be mentioned the restoration of the Great *Stūpa* of Barabudur (1907-11) by Col. Th. van Erp. Another significant feature of this period was the growth of museums. The

archaeological collections of the Prambanan Museum was listed by J. Knebel (*Archaeological Report*, 1902) and that of the Dieng Museum by E. A. Sell (*Archaeological Report*, 1912). Meanwhile Juynboll published his catalogue of Javanese antiquities in the National Museum of Ethnography at Leyden. A new museum was established at Mojokerto near Majapahit in Eastern Java out of the collection made over to the State by an enlightened Javanese Officer in 1913. The Sriwedari Museum was founded at Surakerta in Central Java out of the private collection of a descendant of the Royal House of Mataran. The Museum of the Royal Colonial Institute at Amsterdam was founded in 1913. As for epigraphy, Brandes edited a valuable collection of Old-Javanese charters (*Oud-Javaanasche Oorkonden*) of which a revised version was brought out by Krom in 1913. As regards the interpretation of the monuments, C. M. Pleyte attempted with the imperfect material at his command a complete identification of the bas-reliefs of the first Gallery of Barabudur with the Lalitavistāra Text illustrating Buddha's life. His work (in German) bearing the title *The Buddha legend in the sculptures of the temple of Barabudur* was published from Amsterdam in 1901. The progress in the study of Indo-Javanese literature was marked by Kern's studies on the Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa (*Rāmāyaṇa, Oud-Javaansche Heldendicht*, 1900) and his translation of the first six cantos of the same work (V. G., X), by Juynboll's edition of the Javanese Ādiparva (1902) and Virāṭaparva (1912), by J. G. H. Gunning's edition (1903) of the Bhāratayuddha, " the Iliad of the Javanese people." Meanwhile the rich stores of the Javanese and related literature were made accessible to scholars by the publication (in Dutch) of the *Catalogue of the Javanese and Madurese Mss. in the Leyden University Library* by Vreede (1892) and the *Catalogue of the Malay and Sundanese Mss.* in the same library by Juynboll (1899). A supplement to the Catalogue of Javanese and Madurese Mss. of the Leyden University Library was published by Juynboll in two volumes (Leyden 1907 and 1911) and another Supplement to the Catalogue of Sundanese as well as Balinese and Sasak Mss. in the same library was issued by the same scholar in 1912. These catalogues brought to light a large number of Old-Javanese poems of the *Kakawin* (roughly corresponding to Sanskrit *Kāvya*) class, such as the Indravijaya (story of Vṛtra's triumph and his subsequent death at Indra's hands), the Pārthayajña (story of Arjuna's asceticism and aquisition of the Pāśupata weapon), the Sumanasāntaka (story of the death of Indumatī, Queen of Aja and mother of Daśaratha) and the Harivaṁśa (story of Rukmiṇī's abduction by Kṛṣṇa

and of Kṛṣṇa's war with Jarāsandha). Useful comparisons were made by Hazeu in his (Dutch) work called *The Old-Javanese Ādiparva and its Sanskrit original* (T. B. G. 1901) and by Wulff in his (Danish) work bearing the title *The Old-Javanese Virāṭaparva and its Sanskrit original* (1917). Valuable light was thrown upon the Javanese religion by Juynboll's publication of Sanskrit *mantras* (with Old-Javanese translations) for the worship of Viṣṇu and his incarnations as well as by J. Kats's edition with an accompanying Dutch translation (1910) of the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan, a fundamental work on Javanese Buddhism.

During the last twenty-five years a steady though not uninterrupted progress has been maintained in all branches of Javanese research. To begin with archaeological exploration and research, under the fostering care of F. W. K. Bosch and W. F. Stutterheim, two successive Directors of the Archaeological Service of Java, the scope of the Service was gradually widened so as to include prehistoric archaeology along with Balinese, Muslim, Christian and European antiquities. The activities of the Service were registered in successive numbers of its valuable Archaeological Reports. Vol. VI of this Report (1926) contains an excellent summary of Archaeological work in Netherlands-India from 1901 to 1926 from the pen of N. J. Krom. The publication of these Reports was however stopped in 1931, to be resumed only in 1936. Meanwhile Bosch initiated a new era in archaeological conservation by starting the complete reconstruction of the ruined monuments in place of the usual practice of restoring their fallen parts. This process (called by the technical title of *Anastylose*) was very successfully applied for the restoration of some of the subsidiary shrines of the great Buddhist temple-complex of Caṇḍi Sewu (9th century), of the famous Buddhist shrine of Caṇḍi Kalasan (c. 778 A. D.), of the Śivite temple of Caṇḍi Singhasāri, of the Nāga temples at Panataran and last but not the least the great Śiva-shrine of the Lara-Jongrang group (c. 10th century) at Prambanan. Among the important discoveries standing to the credit of the Department in recent times may be mentioned that of the two earliest Hindu temples in Central Java on the site of the Changal inscription of 732 A. D., one of them being probably identical with the Brahmanical temple said to have been built by King Saṁjaya in that inscription. Another significant discovery is that of the two oldest temples of Eastern Java viz., the Śivite shrines of Badut and Besuki dating from the 8th or 9th century, which by their plan and decoration be-

long to a purely Central-Javanese style. We may lastly mention the discovery of a group of terraced sanctuaries on Mt. Penanggungan in Eastern Java belonging to the final period of Hinduism in the island (1400-1500 A. D.). These have been supposed, with hardly sufficient reason, to combine the indigenous ancestor-worship with Hinduistic beliefs. In the field of epigraphy, as in that of archaeological exploration, the progress in recent times has not been uninterrupted. In 1930 the epigraphist who was to have taken up the long announced and much deferred publication of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Javanicarum* was transferred to another post and the appointment was not renewed till 1939. On the other hand, Stutterheim Naerssen, Goris and others published numbers of new inscriptions in the various learned periodicals. At the same time old inscriptions were re-edited and discussed *e. g.* those of King Pūrṇavarman by Vogel and the Kalasan and Kelurak inscriptions by Bosch (T. B. G. 1928). Among Indian scholars who have taken part in this work may be mentioned N. P. Chakravarti, H. B. Sarkar and B. Ch. Chhabra. Among the most notable discoveries in this field is that of three stone Yūpa inscriptions of King Mūlavarman written in the Pallava script of the 4th or 5th century A. D., as announced in the Year-Book of the *Batavia Society* for 1941.

Turning to the critical study of Javanese art, we have first to refer to the comprehensive account of Indo-Javanese monuments from the earliest times furnished by N. J. Krom's Dutch work called *Introduction to Indo-Javanese Art* (2nd edition, vols. I—II Text, vol. III Plates, 1923). In this monumental work the author, after giving preliminary accounts of the history of Javanese archaeological explorations and the origin and technique of the Javanese art, presents for the first time a systematic and detailed description of the monuments and concludes with a rapid review of Javanese metal-work. In the course of his illuminating survey the author clearly and pointedly explains the general characteristics of the building and plastic styles, and he frequently discusses, as in connection with Brandes's theory of the Indian origin of the Buddhist images of the Caṇḍi Jago temple, the question of Indian influence. In 1926 Krom published his work (in French) called *Javanese Art in the Museums of Holland and Java* in the *Ars Asiatica* Series. It contains 60 excellent Plates illustrating the specimens of Javanese plastic art in stone and metal together with an illuminating Introduction tracing the developmsnt of Javanese art as a whole. Recently R. C. Majumdar (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part II,

Calcutta 1938) has presented an elaborate and well-illustrated description of Javanese architecture and sculpture based primarily upon Krom's great work but also incorporating the results of later research.

The all-important question of the relation of Indian to Javanese art has been discussed by Bosch in a Dutch paper called *A Hypothesis as to the origin of Indo-Javanese Art* (1921 ; Eng. Tr. in *Rūpam*, 1924). While rejecting the comfortable view that the Hindu emigrants were the actual builders of the Middle-Javanese shrines, Bosch seeks to prove from an elaborate comparison between the Mānasāra and the existing remains of Javanese architecture and sculpture that the native Javanese actually knew and applied the written instructions, but the texts which in India remained mere academic projects were executed by them with the zeal of neophytes. "The Hindus were the bringers, the propagators and interpreters of technical texts, but the Javans themselves were the makers of the Central-Javanese shrines." Similar if less definite views have been expressed by Krom according to whom (Cf. *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd edition, Chap. IV) the creators of the art of the Dieng Plateau were neither Hindus nor Indonesians, but rather Hindu-Javans who had adopted the art-traditions of the Indian masters but had also involuntarily introduced some of their Indonesian characteristics into them. In his *Archaeological description of Barabudur* (Vol. II, Ch. XI) Krom similarly says that the art of Barabudur is not foreign, but is a product of Java, a fusion of Hindu and Javanese elements. With this we may compare the following statement of Stutterheim (*J. A. O. S.* LI, No. 1) : " The Hindu-Javanese Chaṇḍi is neither a Hindu temple nor a truly Hinduistic building, though its shape and ornaments are Hindu in origin. It is a thoroughly Indonesian monument based on purely Indonesian conceptions." Bosch's theory has been criticised by O. C. Gangoly (*Rūpam*, 1924)and R. C. Majumdar (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part II, concluding chapter). According to the last-named author, Gupta art was the source of the architecture and sculpture of Malaysia which remained untouched by South Indian influences till the 10th or 11th century A. D.

No single monument has attracted the attention of scholars so much as the great *stūpa* at Barabudur which has gathered a vast literature around itself since its first scientific description by H. C. Cornelius in 1814 (The *Bibliogragḥy of Barabudur*, 1814–1926, appended to the second volume of Krom's *Archaeological Description* runs

through 18 pages). A magnificent *Description of Barabudur* (in Dutch) illustrated with a complete and sumptuous set of Plates was published by the *Royal Institute of Linguistics, Geography and Ethnography* of Netherlands-India in two parts. The first part of this monumental work bearing the title *Archaeological Description* was issued by Krom in two volumes (1920). Chap. III of this work with appropriate plates was published by the same author simultaneously in Dutch and in English translation in 1926. The complete English translation of the whole work was published later by the same author in 1927. Among the outstanding features of this great work are the author's complete and accurate identification of panels of the first gallery of the *stūpa* with the Lalitavistara, the Jātakamālā of Āryaśūra, the Divyāvadāna and other texts suggested before by C. M. Pleyte, S. d'Oldenburg and A. Foucher respectively. He also showed the panels of the second gallery to be illustrative of the Gaṇḍavyūhā (a Mahāyānist Sūtra describing the wanderings of the youth Sudhana all over India in the quest for the highest knowledge) and those of the third and fourth galleries to be illustrations of as yet unidentified texts associated with the Bodhisattvas Maitreya and Samantabhadra respectively. To his credit must also be mentioned the identification of the Dhyāni-Buddhas of the upper terraces with the group of six Dhyāni-Buddhas with Vajrasattva as their chief known to Nepalese, Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism. The probable date of the foundation of the monument was ascertained by the author from a number of short inscriptions at its base, to be the second half of the 8th century. Finally, we have to mention Krom's conclusion that the Buddhism of Barabudur (like Javanese Buddhism in general from first to last) was a kind of Tāntric Mahāyāna based on the Yogācāra. The next step in clearing the mystery of the monument was taken by Sylvain Lévi who discovered (*Recherches à Java et à Bali*, Leyden 1929) the reliefs of the buried basement of Barabudur to be illustrative of a very popular Buddhist text on the working of Karma viz. the *Karmavibhaṅga.* The Sanskrit text was published (Paris 1932) by him with a French translation and the parallel Pali, Chinese, Tibetan and Kuchean versions. This was accompanied by a comparative table of the different recensions of the text and the corresponding panels of the Barabudur. Well might the great French scholar explain, "The *stūpa* of Barabudur had revealed one of its last secrets." A detailed comparison of the Karmavibhaṅga text and the Barabudur reliefs was given by Krom (*Med. der Kon. Ak. van Wet.* lxxvi, Series B, No. 8). Nearly at the same time Bosch was able to prove from a close examination of the original Sanskrit

Mss. in Paris that the panels of the third and fourth galleries illustrated the conclusion of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* representing 110 travels of Sudhana mentioned in the text (See Bosch's Report in *Arch. Rep.* 1929 and his Dutch work called *The Identification of reliefs of the third and fourth galleries of Barabudur*, 1929). It has thus been clearly established that the *Gaṇḍavyūha* was the principal and the central text of Barabudur.

We have now to refer to the second part of the monumental *Description of Barabudur* above mentioned, which bears (in Dutch) the title *The Architectural Description* and was published in 1931 by Th. van Erp. Dealing exhaustively with the style, the technique and the ornaments of the monument, the author observes that Barabudur is " a special Javanese form of the *stūpa*, though fitting in the general evolution of the Indian *stūpa*". The ornaments, according to him, are of purely Indian origin.

The question of symbolism of Barabudur has become, as has been well said, " an apple of discord among scholars." While Foucher, Parmentier and van Erp have offered what may be called " architectural interpretations " of its unique plan and structure, " religious interpretations " have been presented by Krom, Stutterheim and Poerbatjaraka. The whole question has been discussed in a very thorough fashion by P. Mus in a series of papers (in French called *Barabudur, the origins of the stūpa and the transmigration* (*B.E.F.E.O.* 1932–34). According to this scholar the entire monument is a close microcosm, its exterior envelopment corresponding to the cosmic *stūpa*, while its interior corresponds to a *prāsāda.*

Of other monuments in Java forming the subject of independent study in recent times, we may refer only to the great Śiva temple of the Lara-Jongrang group at Prambanan (Central Java) and the main shrine of the temple-complex at Panataran (Eastern Java). These temples are adorned with a series of reliefs depicting the story of the Rāmāyaṇa from the beginning to the expedition to Laṅkā. A comprehensive account of these reliefs accompanied with adequate illustrations is given by Stutterheim in his German work called *Rāma-legends and Rāma-reliefs in Indonesia*, 2 volumes, München 1925). The author mentions the curious fact that while these earlier (9th century) reliefs at Prambanan are distinctly Indian in character but illustrate a non-Vālmīkian version of the Epic, the later (14th century) Panataran series is typically Indonesian in style but is more closely based on Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. A popular and illustrated account based on the above is

presented by J. Kats in his Dutch work bearing the title *Rāmāyaṇa on Javanese temple-reliefs* (Batavia-Leyden 1925).

The Javanese bronzes which are remarkable for their high artistic quality and unique iconographic interest have engaged the serious attention of scholars in recent times, though it has not been possible as yet to classify their styles. We have already referred to Krom's very valuable *Introduction to the Hindu-Javanese Art* as well as his other work called *Javanese Art in the Museum of Holland and Java*, both of which contain important notices of Javanese bronzes. The old Javanese bronzes in the Ethnographical collection of the National Museum at Vienna have been described by R. Heine-Geldern (Vienna 1925), while those in the Royal Ethnographic Museum at Leyden have been catalogued by A. C. Tobi (*Archaeological Report*, 1930). The bronzes in the Batavian Museum have been described by Bosch (*Archaeological Report*, 1923). More recently A. J. Bernet Kempers has discussed (*The Bronzes of Nalanda and Hindu-Javanese art*, Leyden 1933) the mutual relation of Pāla and Javanese bronzes. His conclusion is that the Hindu-Javanese bronzes in general have not developed from Pāla art but the Pāla images have enriched the art of Java with a number of *motifs* and types. In recent times a good synoptic view of this branch of art has been given by R. C. Majumdar (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part II, Calcutta 1938).

Much attention has been bestowed during recent times upon the origin of the Javanese dance and shadow-play (*Wayang*), those two fine flowers of Javanese culture. In his exhaustive work published simultaneously in Dutch and in French called *The Javanese Art of Dancing* (*The Dance in Indo-Javanese Theatre* 1931), Th. B. van Lelyveld has traced the Javanese dance to a distinctly Indian origin. As for the Wayang its indigenous origin was asserted by Brandes (*T. B. G.*, 1889) and by Hazeu (Leyden 1897). On the other hand Krom (*Hindu-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd edition, pp. 49ff) has strongly asserted its Indian origin and his view has been endorsed by R. C. Majumdar (op. cit.).

During the last quarter of the century the steady growth of museums and learned societies to which reference was made above has been well maintained. We may refer to the publication of Bosch's Catalogue of the *Sriwedari Museum* at Surakarta (*Archaeological Report*, 1923) and the opening of the *Museum of the Java*

Institute at Jogyakarta (1935). The *Batavia Society* which issued in 1929 a commemoration volume (*Feestbundel*) on the occasion of its 150th year (1778–1928) has been regularly publishing its valuable Journal (in Dutch) called *The Journal of Indian Linguistics, Geography and Ethnology* (abbreviated as *T. B. G.*). Since 1933 it has been issuing its *Year-Books* containing detailed notices of its aquisitions under the heads *Prehistoric, Archaeological, Historical, Mss., Ceramics* and *Ethnographic* Collections. Other specialised Journals (in Dutch) are *Djāwā*, the Journal of the *Java Institute* at Jogyakarta and the *Contributions to the Linguistics, Geography and Ethnography of Netherlands-India* (abbreviated as B. K. I.), which is the organ of the *Royal Colonial Institute* at the Hague.

Within the last twenty years intensive studies have been carried out in the field of Old-Javanese religious beliefs and practices. We have referred above to Krom's great work *Archaeological Description of Barabudur* in course of which the author discusses the pantheon as well as the form of Buddhism at Barabudur. His view is that the Buddhism of Barabudur was a form of Tāntrik Mahāyāna based on the Yogācāra. In *T. B. G.* 1924 Moens has described the last phase of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Sumatra and Java and has called particular attention to the Tāntric beliefs and practices of the Javanese king Kṛtanagara and the Sumatran king Ādityavarman in the 13th century. In the same year Pigeaud published a critical edition of a fundamental work on Brahmanism in Java called *Tantu Panggelaran* (World Theatre ?). It contains cosmogonic and mythological legends, descriptions of *maṇḍalas* ('Orders of religious ascetics') and *pakṣas* (religious sects) and so forth. A large number of Javanese sacred texts mostly based upon Sanskrit originals and containing Sanskrit verses with Old Javanese translations have been analysed by R. Goris in his fundamental work (in Dutch) called *Old-Javanese and Balinese Theology* (1926). Among the texts utilised by Goris may be mentioned the *Sūryasevana*, the *Bhuvanakoṣa*, the *Bhuvanasaṁkṣepa*, the *Sang Hyang Mahājñāna* and the *Bṛhaspatitattva.* The last work has been proved by A. Ziesenis (*Z. D. M. G.* XIII, No. 2) to belong to the literature of *Āgamas* which are the sources of the *Śaivasiddhānta.* The last-named author has since published in German a valuable paper called *Studies in the history of Śaivism and Śaivistic system in the Old-Javanese literature* (*B. K. I.*, 1939). A summary of religious conditions in Java based on Dutch authorities is given by R. C. Majumdar (op. cit.).

Turning to the study of Old-Javanese literature we have to mention Juynboll's translation of the Javanese Rāmāyaṇa (Cantos VII-XXIII) in *B. K. I.* in continuation of Kern's translation of the same (Cantos I-VI). A new series called *Bibliotheca Javanica* has been started under the auspices of the venerable *Batavia Society* for the publication of Old-Javanese and Middle-Javanese texts. Among works so far published (with translations) in the series are the *Tantrīkāmandaka* (ed. G. Hooykas), the *Smaradahana* (ed. L. Poerbatjaraka), the *Nītiśāstra* (ed. Poerbatjaraka), the Old-Javanese *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (ed. J. Gonda) and the Old-Javanese *Bhīṣma-parvan* (ed. Gonda). The first consists of three mediaeval Javanese versions of stories and fables with parallel Siamese and Laotian versions which bear the closest of affinity to the Kanarese version of the *Pañcatantra* by Durgasiṁha, the second tells the story immortalised by Kālidāsa in his *Kumārasaṁbhavam* about Kāma's being burnt to ashes by the wrath of Śiva, the third is a collection of wise sayings, moral precepts, and so forth of the *Cāṇakyanīti* class, the fourth is the most important Javanese work of the *purāṇa* class. Another work of the last-named category, the *Agastyaparva* has been edited by Gonda (*B. K. I.*, 1933). The Old-Javanese prose works of the *Mahābhārata* cycle that have recently been published include the *Koravāśrama* (ed. J. L. Swellengrebel) and the *Navaruci* (ed. M. Prijohoetomo). In his paper *Hindu Literature in Java* (I. A. L., VI. 1932), C. C. Berg distinguished between three periods of this literature as also between its two court literatures and its popular religious literature. The study of this literature, however, according to the same scholar has to remain provisional for the present because of the paucity of critical editions of texts and of works on grammar and lexicography. A comprehensive account of Old-Javanese and Balinese literature in all its branches with special reference to its Indian affinities has been presented by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar in his work *Indian Influence on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Greater India Society's Publication, Calcutta 1934). More recently R. C. Majumdar has given a good summary of the whole subject based on the Dutch authorities in his *Suvarṇadvīpa* (Part II).

The last quarter of this century has been very prolific in discussions of problems relating to the history and culture of Java. To take a few examples the place of the sage Agastya in Javanese culture-history has been discussed by O. C. Gangoly (*The cult of Agastya and the origin of Indian colonial art*, (*Rūpam*, 1926), L. Poer-

batjaraka (*Agastya in den Archipel*, Leyden 1926), K. A. N. Sastri (*T. B. G.* 1936). The history and topography of Śrīvijaya and Kaṭāha has been discussed by Mr. Moens (*T. B. G.* 1937), K. A. N. Sastri (*J. G. I. S.* 1938, *B. E. F. E. O.* 1940). Of a more general character is the *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture during Pallava rule as evidenced by inscriptions* of B. Ch. Chhabra (*J. A. S. B. Letters*, 1935). Of outstanding importance is the standard work of N. J. Krom called Hindu-Javanese History (*Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 1st edition 1926, 2nd edition 1931). Based on an exhaustive study of all the available data it traces the history of Java from the earliest times to the ultimate triumph of Islam in the early sixteenth century. Accompanying the author's notices of political history are illuminating studies on the art and literature of the island during the successive centuries. This fundamental work has been utilised by R. C. Majumdar (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part I), but the author has also sought to throw new light upon the numerous unsolved problems of Javanese history and culture.

Bali

The small island of Bali lying immediately east of Java enjoys, as is well known, the unique distinction of maintaining its Hindu culture down to modern times. But unfortunately the materials are lacking for a connected account of its history, art and literature. The plausible identification by Pelliot (*B. E. F. E. O.*, 1904) of the island of P'oli mentioned by the Chinese authorities of the 6th and 7th centuries A. D. with Bali had the result of throwing some light upon the obscure history of the island during those centuries. From these accounts we learn that kings bearing the family-name of Kauṇḍinya and belonging to the Kṣatriya caste ruled the country in those early times and that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Nikāya was almost universally prevalent there. In recent times the systematic search for antiquities has yielded a number of stone and copper-plate inscriptions in Sankrit, Old-Balinese, and Old-Javanese dating from the 8th century. Transcripts of these inscriptions have been published by P. V. van Stein Collenfels in the *Epigraphia Balica*, I (1926) and by Stutterheim in his Dutch work called *The Antiquities af Bali* (1929). These records have disclosed the existence of a line of independent kings of the 10th century bearing Hindu names viz., Ugrasena, Janasādhuvarmmadeva, Keśarivarma, and so forth. In 1926 a Dutch

architect, P. A. J. Moojen, published an ambitious work called *The Art of Bali: Introductory studies on the Architecture*, which claimed to discuss the history and general characteristics of Balinese art, its religious and sociological basis, the rules and traditions of its building construction and so forth. The history, palaeography, topography, religion and art of Bali were discussed along with its inscriptions by Stutterheim in the work *The Antiquities of Bali* above meutioned. The art of Bali was also discussed by the same scholar in his *Indian Influences in Old-Balinese Art* (India Society, London 1935), which traces the history of religion and antiquities of the island from early times down to the 14th century A. D. Distinguishing four successive periods of Balinese art, the author says that the art of the early period (8th–10th centuries) was dominated by Indian traditions, while during the Early and the Middle Indo–Balinese periods (11th–12th and 13th–14th centuries) the Indian tradition was gradually modified by local as well as the imported Javanese elements. The Modern period dating from the 15th century does not call here for any special comment.

In his work *Sanskrit Texts from Bali* (G. O. S. lxvii, Baroda 1933), Sylvain Lévi has classified the Balinese Sanskrit works discovered by him under four heads : (1) *Caturveda*, (2) *Stotras*, (3) *Buddhaveda*, (4) *Kārakasaṁgraha, Caritra Rāmāyaṇa, Naiṣṭhika-jñāna, Daśaśīla* and the exercises in translation from Sanskrit into Balinese. The first really consists of the first sections of the *Nārāyaṇa-Atharvaśira-Upaniṣad*, the second consists of thirty-nine short pieces, the third dealing with the daily ritual of a Buddhist priest consists of fragments of Tantras.

The history and culture of Bali have been investigated by Krom in his Hindu-Javanese work already mentioned and more recently by R. C. Majumdar in his *Suvarṇadvīpa* (Parts I and II).

Borneo and Celebes

The large island of Borneo called Tanjungnagara and Bakulapura in the mediaeval Javanese records was colonised by Hindu settlers as early as the 4th century A. D. The oldest Sanskrit inscriptions of the island belonging to that period, viz. the *Yūpa* inscriptions of king Mūlavarman, were discovered as far back as 1879, and, being first published by Kern, were afterwards (1918) re-edited by Vogel. These records refer themselves to a line of Hindu (or Hinduised) kings ruling in East Borneo of whom the last, namely Mūlavarman, performed the Bahusuvarṇaka sacri-

fice attended with splendid gifts to Brahmans. Inscriptions with Buddhist formulas have since been found in West Borneo and these have been edited by B. Ch. Chhabra (*J. A. S. B.*, *Letters*, 1935). An important expedition sent to Central and East Borneo in 1925 resulted in the discovery of a remarkable group of Brahmanical and Buddhist images concealed in a cave. Among these were stone images of Mahādeva, Nandī, Kārttikeya and Gaṇeśa. The Buddhist images were of a peculiar iconographic type. These precious sculptures along with some related images in the Batavia Museum were published by Bosch in the *Archaeological Report*, 1925 and in the Official report of the expedition, 1927. Judging from the style of the images, Bosch held that they could be attributed neither to Indian nor Indo-Javanese colonists, but were probably the work of Indo-Javanese settlers long out of touch with the homeland or else of Hinduised Dyaks. Another important group of Hindu relics from Borneo has been discussed (*J. G. I. S.* III, 1936) by O. C. Gangoly, who concludes that the question whether Borneo derived its Hindu culture directly from India or indirectly from Java must remain open. Recently R. C. Majumdar (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part II) has suggested from a fresh examination of the Hindu images on the East coast of Borneo that the Hindu colonists developed an independent art somewhat influenced by Indo-Javanese traditions.

Passing from Borneo to the neighbouring island of Celebes, we have to mention the large-sized bronze Buddha which was found there and is now preserved in the *Batavia Museum*. Judging from schematic folds of its drapery, Bosch has concluded (*T.B.G.*, 1933) that it was imported directly from Amarāvatī.

The fragmentary records of Hindu culture in Borneo and Celebes have been pieced together by R. C. Majumdar in his work above mentioned.

Sumatra

By far the most important contribution that has been made in recent times to the general history of Sumatra and adjoining lands is the brilliant reconstruction of the rise and fall of the Hindu kingdom of Śrīvijaya by the French scholar, Çœdès, in 1918. In his epoch-making paper (in French) with the title *The Kingdom of Śrīvijaya* (*B. E. F. E. O.* XVIII) he traced with the help of the surviving archaeological remains and the scattered Chinese, Arab

and South Indian references the fortunes of this kingdom from the latter part of the 7th to the 12th century. From the evidence of the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing it was already known that Śrīvijaya was a chief emporium of trade between China and India and was the centre of Buddhist learning in the islands of the Southern Seas. Çœdés's new hypothesis that Śrīvijaya city which he identified with Palembang was also the nucleus of the great Śailendra dynasty that ruled Malayasia for more than two centuries was developed by Krom and Vogel in their papers (in Dutch) bearing the titles *The Sumatran period of Javanese history* (Leyden 1919) and *The kingdom of Śrīvijaya* (*B. K. I.*, 1919) respectively. In these papers was emphasised the enormous influence excercised by Śrīvijaya kings in introducing Mahāyāna Buddhism into Java and in building the splendid monuments of Barabudur, Caṇḍi Kalasan and the like. These results were incorporated by Ferrand in his connected account (in French) called *The Sumatran Empire of Śrīvijaya* (*J. A.* 1922) tracing the history of the Śrīvijaya or Śailendra Empire from the earliest times to the 12th century A. D. and later. The history of Sumatra was treated on similar lines by Krom in his *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* already mentioned. In 1927 Çœdés published a French article called *Fall of the Śrīvijaya Kingdom* (*B.K.I.*, vol. 33) tracing its decline from about 1178 A. D. In *B.E.F. E.O.* 1930 Çœdés wrote (in French) a paper called *The Malay Inscriptions of Śrīvijaya* where, while re-editing the four oldest inscriptions of this kingdom, he took the inscription of 683 A. D. to mean that Vajrayāna Buddhism, already known to have prevailed in Bengal towards the middle of the 7th century, was established in Sumatra towards the close of that century. The brilliant hypothesis of Çœdés to which reference has been made above has met with a considerable amount of criticism in later times. In his paper *A Javanese period in Sumatran history* (Surakarta 1929) Stutterheim sought completely to reverse Çœdés's position by asserting that the Śailendras originally belonged to Java and afterwards conquered Śrīvijaya. Recently R. C. Majumdar (*B. E. F. E. O.* 1933, *J. G. I. S.* 1934, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part I, Bk. 2 App.) has given good grounds for doubting on the one hand the identity of Śrīvijaya with the kingdom of the Śailendras and the Zabag and San-fo-tsi kingdoms of the Arab and Chinese writers, and on the other hand for identifying the last three as synonymous terms and placing them in the northern part of the Malay peninsula. Majumdar's view was substantially accepted by Çœdés (*J. G. I. S.* 1234). In another respect Çœdés's view has been modified by later research. Referring to the old Malay

inscriptions of Śrīvijaya, Vallée Poussin has shown the slight part played therein by Tantrism and has rehabilitated the evidence of I-tsing about the predominance of the Sarvāstivāda school in the Archipelago.

Sumatra is very poor in archæological remains so much so that a connected history of its architecture and sculpture cannot be written. Nevertheless important finds of Buddhist sculptures in stone and metal along with other antiquities were made at Palembang after 1920. The Indian affinities of these sculptures were discussed by Bosch (*Arch. Rep.*, 1930) and Krom (*ABIA.* 1931) as well as by R. C. Majumdar (*JISOA*, I; *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part II, pp. 322–26) and D. P. Ghosh (*J. G. I. S.*, I and III). According to R. Heine-Geldern (*Archaeology and Art of Sumatra*), Gupta, South Indian and Javanese influences affected the Sumatran art prior to and during the Śrīvijaya period, but these could not efface the indigenous style. The first systematic excavations were carried out in Sumatra on a number of ancient sites by F. M. Schnitger in 1935 and 1936. The results were recorded by him in a series of well-illustrated monographs (in Dutch) called *Archaeological Finds in Padang Lawas (Central Tapanuli)*, *Hindu Antiquities of Batang Hari* and *Archaeological Finds in Palembang* (Leyden 1936). A detailed account of his discoveries in Central, Southern and Western Sumatra with a large number of illustrations was given by the same author in his work *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra* (Leyden 1937). This work discloses a wealth of antiquities viz., terracottas, stone and bronze sculptures of superb workmanship representing Śiva and Viṣṇu as well as Buddha, Lokeśvara and Maitreya besides architectural remains of *stūpas* and so forth. The sculptures have been held to belong to the Amarāvatī, Gupta and Pāla styles. Reference is also made to the evidences of Bhairava cult in vogue in the country in late Hindu times. Some of Schnitger's iconographical identifications have since been corrected by J. N. Banerjee in *J. G. I. S*, IV, 1937. Quite recently Krom has brought forward in a Dutch paper called *The Sanctuaries of Palembang* (*M. der K. N. A. W.*, Deel I, No. 7) evidence to prove that Palembang was identical with Old Malayu and that the Buddhist sanctuary on its western side reflected the South Indian style, wihile the Siddhayātrā sanctuary on its eastern side, which was Indonesian at first, was Hinduised after the 7th century.

Malay Peninsula.

The first detailed and authentic account of the Malay Peninsula, the Malayadvīpa and the Kaṭāhadvīpa of the Purāṇas, is given by Ptolemy in the 2nd century A. D., evidently in the light of the accurate knowledge acquired at that time by the Indians. In the mediaeval period Malay was sometimes included in great empires like those of Śrīvijaya and the Śailendras as well as the Indo-Javanese empire of Majapahit. At other times it was split up into a number of insignificant kingdoms. But no connected account of the peninsula is traceable from the scanty records. The survival of Hindu rule in different parts of the peninsula (Pahang or Indrapura, Kelantan and Malacca) may be traced to the second decade of the 15th century which ushered in the advent of Islam.

It was nearly a century ago that Lt. Col. James Low carried out some unsystematic excavations in the north-west part of British Malay forming Province Wellesley and the Kedah State. He discovered a set of twelve Sanskrit inscriptions which were published by J. W. Laidlay (*J. A. S. B.* 1848-1849) in a very imperfect fashion. These inscriptions have since been edited by competent scholars like Kern (*V. G.* III) and B. Ch. Chhabra (*J. A. S. B. Letters* 1935). They prove that colonists from Northern and Southern India were settled on the west coast of Malay by the 4th or 5th centuries A. D. and that they followed the Buddhist religion. Four of these inscriptions refer to a great sailor Buddhagupta, an inhabitant of Raktamṛttikā (identified with Rāṅgāmāṭi in modern Murshidabad district of Bengal). Another group of Sanskrit inscriptions of the same early period discovered at Ligor, Takuapa and Caiya in North Malay was published with facsimile in the *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indo-Chine* (1910), but they still remain un-edited. The opening up of the States of Kedah and Perak to rubber plantation and tin mining in quite recent times has brought to light a number of antiquities which were described by Ivor H. N. Evans, Ethnographer to the Perak Museum (*Papers on the Ethnology and Archaeology of the Malay Peninsula*, Cambridge 1927). They show that the Kedah region was occupied by Indian colonists professing Śaivism as well as Buddhism during the 4th-5th centuries A. D. According to the same evidence an Indian colony was settled at Perak by the 5th century A. D. Among the objects discovered by Evans was a seal from Perak with the legend *Sri-Viṣṇuvarmaṇaḥ* in incorrect Sanskrit

in Pallava Grantha characters. (For discussion of this seal see B. Ch. Chhabra, *JGIS II*, 1935, giving full references). Unfortunately no law was passed for the protection of ancient monuments, as had been done in India and Indonesia. " Hence sites of the utmost importance must have been destroyed by mining operations in Perak, while in Kedah many promising mounds were demolished to provide road material or merely levelled down as being useless obstructions. " (Quaritch Wales *ABIA*. 1937, p. 38). However that may be, chance finds have been made recently from the tin mines at Perak, of three bronze Avalokiteśvara images in addition to the bronze Buddhas brought to light by Evans. (For a description of the whole group with full references and some illustrations see H. G. Quaritch Wales, *Archaeological Researches on Ancient Indian Colonisation*, *JRASMB* XVIII, Part I, February 1940).

The first systematic archaeological exploration of British Malay was undertaken by H. G. Quaritch Wales under the auspices of the Greater India Research Committee in London and with the generous support of the Malay States concerned. Following closely upon his first two archaeological expeditions to Siamese territories (to which reference has been made above), he led his third expedition (1937–39) into the Malay States of Kedah, Perak and Johore. The valuable results of this expedition were published in a special number (Vol. XVIII, Part I, 1940) of the *Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.* Among the objects brought to light by the explorer may be mentioned basements of *stūpas* containing Sanskrit inscriptions in South Indian characters of the 4th–6th centuries mentioning the Buddhist creed and Mahāyāna Buddhist verses, the remains of Brahmanical temples of the 7th–8th centuries with fragments of Śivite images, and lastly, gold and silver discs with names of Bodhisattvas inscribed in Sanskrit in South Indian characters of the 9th century. Deriving his historical conclusions from the above data, the author postulated four successive waves of Hindu colonisation from the 1st century to c. 900 A. D. Again, while finding further support for his view that the Śailendra empire had its head-quarters in the Malay Peninsula, he was led to locate Kaḍāram, the capital of the Śailendras, in the Kinta valley in Perak, in modification of his previous hypothesis (strongly criticised by Çœdès, *J.R.A.S.M.B.* XIV 1936) identifying the same successively with Caiya and Ligor. He also attempted the reconstruction of the later history of Kedah (from the close of the 13th century to the conversion to Islam in

1474 A. D.) by means of a critical analysis of the Kedah Annals. One of the kings mentioned in these Annals, Raja Bersiong, according to him was not only a historical personage but was addicted to the Bhairava cult of which the popularity is proved by the famous Bhairava statue representing the Sumatran King Ādityavarman iu the 13th century.

As regards general history of the Malay Peninsula, the invaluable Chinese texts referring to the kingdoms of the Southern Seas in the early centuries of the Christian era have been studied and discussed by a number of scholars such as Groeneveldt, Schlegel, Pelliot and Ferrand ever since the seventh decade of the last century. But unfortunately the identifications of most of these kingdoms still remain matters of dispute. Provisionally, however, we may take these accounts to mean that a certain number of Hindu kingdoms existed in Malay in the 5th—6th centuries. Such are "Lang-yu-su" (Isthmus of Kra or of Ligor) " where the precious Sanskrit was generally known," 'Kan-to-li' (Kaḍāra ?) where Buddhism was held in the highest veneration and Karmaraṅga or Carmaraṅga (Ligor) mentioned in the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa and other Indian works. Regarding the later history of Malay we have already referred to the brilliant paper of Çœdès on *The Kingdom of Śrīvijaya* (*B. E. F. E. O.* 1918) pointing to a great Sumatran empire having its capital at Palembang and including within its limits Malay and Java in the late 8th century. We have also noticed that R. C. Majumdar has on good grounds called in question Çœdès's identification of the Śrīvijaya kingdom with the Śailendra empire and placed the seat of the latter in North Malay. In this connection Majumdar stated that the Śailendras were probably immigrants from Kaliṅga who spread their sway over the Far East by way of Lower Burma and Malay. On the other hand Çœdès (*J. G. I. S.*, I, 1934) has suggested that the Śailendras were originally related to the king of Fu-nan and, after their expulsion from Indo-China, resumed the old dynastic title and reasserted the old political and territorial claims. Other views have been put forward by Przyluski (*J. G. I. S.*, I.) and K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (*TBG* LXXV). As for the last phase of Hindu rule in Malay, not to speak of the Chinese texts studied and discussed by Groeneveldt and Schlegel, we may mention the indigenous traditions collected from the Malay chronicles and the early Portuguese accounts by Ferrand (*J. A.* 1918). In *J. R. A. S. M. B.* 1935, R. O. Winstedt published a connected history of Malay from the earliest

times to the 19th century. It contains a chapter on the Hindu period based on the researches of Çœdès and Krom. Recently R. C. Majumdar has given (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, Parts I and II) a complete account of the history and culture of Malay from the earliest times to the end of Hindu rule in the peninsula. Based on the researches of previous scholars, it attempts the solution of many of the unsolved problems of Ancient Malayan history.

Ceylon

The island of Ceylon, the Siṁhaladvīpa of the Pali Chronicles, was converted to Buddhism by Aśoka's missionaries during the reign of its king, Devanampiya Tissa. Under this pious king and his equally pious successors like Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (101–77 B. C.), Waṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya (c. 100–76 B. C.) and Mahāsena (277–304 A. D.), Anurādhapura, the Ceylonese capital and a "Veritable Buddhist Rome" was adorned with magnificent structures like the Thuparama *dāgaba*, the Jetavana *vihāra* (which is the largest of its kind even in Ceylon and stands on a stone platform nearly 8 acres in extent) and the Lohaprāsāda or the "Brazen Tower" (originally constructed as monastery of nine stories and still existing in its foundations which extend over an area of 250 Sq. miles and comprise 1600 monoliths 12' high). Taken and plundered by the Pāṇḍyas, Anurādhapura was abandoned for Polonnaruwa (otherwise called Kalingapura or Pulastipura) which remained the Ceylonese capital from the 9th to the middle of the 13th century. Among its splendid monuments are the Thuparama, the "Northern" temple adorned with frescoes and the Jetavana monastery with Laṅkātilaka 'the largest Buddhist temple in Ceylon', all of which are attributed to the greatest of the Sinhalese kings, Parakkamabāhu I (1164–97 A. D.).

The beginnings of the scientific study of Sinhalese archæology can be traced back to the seventies of the last century when the first Archæological Commissioner was appointed in the person of P. Goldschmid who has been called "the founder of Ceylonese epigraphy". To the same period goes back the foundation of the Colombo Museum through the enlightened efforts of Sir William Gregory, Governor of Ceylon (1872–77 A. D.). To Edward Müller, Goldschmid's successor as Archæological Commissioner, belongs the credit of issuing the first corpus of Sinhalese inscriptions (*Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon collected and published for Government by Dr. Edward Müller*, 2 vols., London 1883). To this period also belongs

the foundation (1882) by T. W. Rhys Davids of the renowned *Pali Text Society* which has since earned the gratitude of all lovers of Indian culture by its magnificent series of publications of Pali canonical as well as non-canonical texts with a large number of translations. What high respect was entertained towards these texts by the promoters of the Society will best appear from the following extract quoted from their prospectus:—"For this period c. 400-250 B. C. they have preserved for us a record quite uncontaminated by filtrations through an European mind of the everyday beliefs and customs of a people nearly related to ourselves, just as they were passing through the first stage of civilisation. They are our best authorities for the early history of that interesting system of religion so nearly allied to some of the latest speculations among ourselves and which has influenced so powerfully and for so long a time so large a portion of the human race—the system of religion which we now called Buddhism". In the last decade of the 19th century and the first decade of the present important steps were taken towards the advance of Sinhalese archaeological studies. The *Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* commenced the issue of its *Journal* from the close of the last century. A valuable set of drawings of archaeological remains in Anurādhapura prepared by J. G. Smither as far back as 1877 was published by order of the Government of Ceylon in 1894. The *Archaeological Survey of Ceylon* was founded in 1890, and H. C. P. Bell distinguished his long term of office (1890-1912) as Archaeological Commissioner by practically exhuming the dead city of Anurādhapura, by clearing and restoring fortress-city of Sigiriya and by excavating the main group of buildings of Parakkamabāhu's palace at Polonnaruwa. Among the notable buildings described and illustrated by him in his valuable series of *Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon* may be mentioned the Śiva shrine at Polonnaruwa built in 11th or 12th century, as well as the circular shrine and the seven-storied tower built at the same city by King Nissanka Malla in the 12th century. The second of these structures was described by him as 'the most beautiful specimen of Buddhist stone architecture existing in Ceylon.' Meanwhile Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasingh, appointed Epigraphist to the Ceylonese Government in 1899, published the first volume of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica* (1904-1912) containing the text and translation of a large number of new inscriptions. This was followed by the publication by the same scholar of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. II, 1912-28 and Vol. III, Part I, 1928). In the former

Volume is included *A Chronological Table of Ceylon Kings* from Vijaya (483–445 B. C.) down to Śrī-Vikrama Rājasiṁha (1798–1815 A. C.). In 1909 H. Parker, who had served for thirty-one years in the Irrigation Department of Ceylon, published his important work *Ancient Ceylon* giving minute accounts of the lost cities of Ceylon as well as the ancient *dāgabas*, inscriptions and coins and the earliest irrigation-works. The interpretation of Sinhalese art was furthered by the valuable writing of A. K. Coomaraswamy, *Mediaeval Sinhalese Art* (London 1908), *Mahāyānist Buddhist Images from Ceylon and Java* (JRAS. 1909), *Bronzes of Ceylon* (*Memoirs of the Colombo Museum*, Vol. I, Colombo 1914). To the same scholar belongs the credit of identifying (*Spolia Zeylanica*, VI. 1909) the wonderful seated figures of the Isurumuniya Vihāra at Anurādhapura with the sage Kapila, well known to Indian legend.

During the last twenty years the study of Sinhalese art and archaeology has made steady progress. In the third decade of this century A. M. Hocart as Archaeological Commissioner published the results of his archaeological exploration and research in successive *Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon*. He also edited three volumes of *Memoirs* of this Survey of which the first (Colombo 1924) dealt principally with the monuments of Anurādhapura, the second (Colombo 1926) with those of Polonnaruwa and the third (London 1931) with the Temple of the Tooth at Kandy. As editor of the *Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G, Archaeology, Ethnology, etc.*, (Vol. I, 1924–28, Vol. II, 1928–33) he published numerous notes on the art and archaeology, not only of Ceylon but also of India proper. Of special interest are his attempts to trace the obscure history of development of Sinhalese sculpture and architecture according to types and to estimate the extent of Indian influence upon the same. For the recent advance in Sinhalese archaeology the credit is mostly due to S. Paranavitana, Epigraphic Assistant to the Archaeological Commissioner. In 1934 and 1935 he excavated the remains of a *stūpa* (identified by him as the Kaṇṭaka Chetiya of *ante* 1st century B. C.) at Mihintale. It ranks among the earliest *stūpas* in the island and its sculptures are counted among the earliest remains of Sinhalese plastic art. Its well-preserved basement had four projections at the cardinal points reminiscent of the types of the Andhra monuments of the Krisna valley, which were adorned with fine friezes of Haṁsas and Gaṇas, and were flanked by sculptural stalæ surmounted by figures of elephants, lions, bulls and horses. (See Paranavitana, *Excavation of the Kaṇṭaka Chetiya at Mihintale, A. B.*

I. A. 1934). A detailed account of the archaeological excavations carried out at Anurādhapura during the years 1928–29, 1932–33 was given by the same scholar in his monograph *The Excavations in the Citadel of Anurādhapura, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon*, Vol. IV, Colombo 1936). Among the buildings exposed during these excavations was a unique structure of the 8th century A.D. having a square plan and a projection from the middle of each face of which the prototype has since been sought (S. K. Saraswati in *J. G. I. S.* IV) in East Indian temples. To the *Ceylon Journal of Science, Sec. G.*, Vol. II, Paranavitana contributed a valuable *Archaeological Summary* showing that the earliest *stūpas* of Ceylon followed the Indian model, consisting of the *harmmikā* and above it an umbrella or series of umbrellas in stone supported by stone posts, but about the fifth century A. D. there was developed the cylindrical structure above the *harmmikā* and above that again the tapering spire which was nothing but the old *Chatrāvali* with the space between the umbrellas filled with brick work. To the same Journal he contributed a valuable paper on *Mahāyānism in Ceylon* proving from archaeological and literary evidence the prevalence (from the 3rd to the 15th century) of various forms of Mahāyāna (including the Tāntrik Vajrayāna) and tracing the survival of Mahāyāna in Ceylonese Buddhism at the present day. As editor of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. III, Parts 2–6 (1929–33) and Vol. IV, Part 1 (1934) Paranavitana has published numerous inscriptions ranging from the pre-Christian to late mediaeval times. Among these are a large number of cave-inscriptions written in Indian Prakrit and in Brahmi script mentioning the names of donors of caves to the Buddhist saṁgha (See Paranavitana, *Brāhmī Inscriptions recently discovered in Ceylon, A. B. I. A.* 1934 and *Epigraphical discoveries in Ceylon during the year 1935, A. B. I. A.* 1935). Some of these donors have been identified with the Ceylonese kings of the 1st century before and after Christ mentioned in the chronicles. A set of ninety-one Sanskrit inscriptions engraved in copper plaques and containing fragments of the *Pañcaviṁśatisāhasrikā Prajñapāramitā* was brought to light by the same scholar from the ruins of a *stūpa* (*Epigraphia Zeylanica* III). Another scholar who deserves mention in this connection is H. W. Codrington. Besides contributing important papers on the archaeology of Ceylon, he wrote a monograph called *Ceylon Coins and Currency* (Colombo 1940). From this we learn that silver *purāṇas* so well known to ancient Indian numismatics continued to circulate in Ceylon till *c.* 300 A. D.

As regards the branch of Ceylonese art A. K. Coomarswamy, in his comprehensive work *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (London 1927), traced for the first time in broad outline the development of Sinhalese art through the 'classical' (*ante* 8th century), the 'mediaeval' (9th–14th centuries) and the 'late mediaeval, (14th century to 1815 A. D.) periods. In Vincent A. Smith's work *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (2nd edition, Oxford 1930), the main types of Sinhalese architecture and sculpture have been sought to be distinguished and interesting comparisons have been made with the Indian types. In his paper (in French) called *Pāla and Sena Art in Outer India* (*E'tudes d'Orientalisme Linossier*, pp. 277–285) Réne Grousset has traced the influence of Pāla and Sena art upon the sculptures of Ceylon. A number of art objects–bas–reliefs, sculptures in the round and architectural fragments–found at Anurādhapura, Polonnaruwa, Sigiriya and other sites during recent times have been proved by S. Paranavitana (*Examples of Andhra Art recently found in Ceylon*, *A. B. I. A.* 1936) to be products of the Andhra schools of Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.

Lastly as regards the general history of Ceylon and the history of Ceylonese culture, we may begin by mentioning H. W. Codrington's work *A Short History of Ceylon* (London 1926), which traces the history of the island from the earliest times to 1833 A. D. It has a prefatory note on the chronology of Ceylon and a list of its sovereigns and it concludes with a chapter on archaeology from the pen of A. M. Hocart. More recently G. C. Mendis has published *The Early History of Ceylon* (3rd ed., Calcutta 1938) giving within a short compass the political as well as cultural history of the island from the earliest times to the close of the 15th century. From the stand–point of Indian culture the author's account of the spread of Sanskrit along with Mahāyānism and Brahmanism is of special interest. Coming to another point, we may mention that the relations of the Imperial Cholas with Ceylon have been fully studied by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (*The Cholas*, Vol. I, Madras 1935) in the light of Tamil as well as Sinhalese documents. The old Sinhalese revenue system has been described by H. W. Codrington in his work *Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon* (Colombo 1938). Above all, W. Geiger in a series of papers called *Contributions from the Mahāvaṁsa to our knowledge of the mediaeval culture of Ceylon* (*J. G. I. S.* vol. II, No. 2, vol. III, No. 2, vol. IV, No. 2, vol. V, Nos. 1–2, July 1935–July 1938) has utilised the important data from the greatest Sinhalese chronicle to illustrate fully the kingship, the administration and the social life in the island down to the mediaeval times.

LINGUISTICS IN INDIA
(1917-1942)

By

SUNITI KUMAR CHATTERJI

In writing a brief survey of the progress of the linguistic science in India for the last twenty-five years, on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, it is pleasant to recall that the great scholar of Maharashtra and of India, whom the Institute worthily commemorates and whose name will be uttered with respect wherever Indological studies are pursued, was himself one of the pioneers in the field of Indian Linguistics. The discovery of Sanskrit in India by European scholars, particularly Sir William Jones, enabled them to rediscover their own languages, modern and classical; and the science of Comparative Philology, or Linguistics, was born in Europe when the comparative and historical method was made possible through the light from Sanskrit illuminating Greek, Latin, Germanic, Slav and the rest. India had not yet roused herself from the slumber of ages—the magic wand of European science and European curiosity had not yet touched her into life once again: so the land of Pāṇini remained a stranger to all that the intellect of Europe did, in working out the Indo-European bases of Sanskrit and her sisters and cousins of the West, throughout the greater part of the 19th century. After some progress was achieved in the study of the classical languages of the Indo-European family, the modern ones of the same family in their different branches were taken up, singly or all together; and John Beames presented the first comprehensive bird's eye view of the development of the Modern Aryan Languages of India in three volumes in the seventies of the last century (1872, 1875, 1879). Indian Linguistics with reference to the last or current phase of Indo-Aryan as a branch of Indo-European thus came into being some seventy years ago, and it appeared to be quite complete in its general outline. At once a brilliant galaxy of scholars showed their light by their publications. Ernst Trumpp's *Sindhi Grammar* and John T. Platts's *Grammar of the Hindustani or Urdu Language* both appeared in 1872, and both of them share honours with Beames's *Comparative Grammar* as pioneer works in the etymological study of the forms of New Indo-Aryan, confining themselves,

however, to individual languages. Among the eminent scholars in whose hands Indian Linguistics, particularly with regard to New Indo-Aryan, took shape (the study of Dravidian and of Kol or Munda were already broad-based in the works of Caldwell, Kittel and Vinson, and Skrefsrud), we have to mention Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, A. Rudolf Höernle, C. J. Lyall, George Abraham Grierson and S. H. Kellogg, all of them workers of the first generation in Indo-Aryan linguistics,—apart from others who were working in Old Indo-Aryan (Sanskrit, Vedic) and Middle Indo-Aryan (Pali and the Prakrits). Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar's is the first name we can mention with pride in the list of those amongst us in India who took upon themselves to pay back our *ṛṣi-ṛṇa*, the debt that we owe to the scholars and sages, which we are enjoined to repay by emulating them in their studies and in advancing their researches by our own participation in them: and until about twenty-five years ago from now, his was the only name. His *Wilson Philological Lectures* delivered before the University of Bombay in 1877, before the third volume of Beames's work was out, and published in instalments in the "Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society" in its 16th and 17th volumes (in 1883-1885 and 1887-1889) and finally issued as a single work in 1914, gave a very clear *exposé* of the development of the Aryan Speech in India from the Old Indo-Aryan period onwards, and it was a work which enabled a large number of students in India and outside India to form a proper estimate of this development in its correct perspective. "The method I followed," as R. G. Bhandarkar has said in the Preface to the *Lectures* in 1914, "is strictly historical, tracing the modern vernaculars from the original Sanskrit through all the different stages of development of which we have evidence and assigning the different transformations to their causes, natural or physical, racial and historical." This is a clear-cut statement of a method the soundness of which will be subscribed to by all, and although with the accession of new facts and more reasonable lines of approach we have in some cases to deviate from this great founder of linguistic studies among Indians, the value of Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar's *Wilson Philological Lectures on Sanskrit and the Derived Languages delivered in 1877* as a classic in the subject will remain for ever.

Unfortunately no one among Indians took to linguistic studies with the equipment and the enthusiasm of the master, at least for some time, although India and particularly Maharashtra produced

eminent Sanskritists. Linguistics or Comparative Philology as a special subject for advanced students was not given a place in the curriculum of any Indian University before 1907 when an examination was instituted in it by the University of Calcutta for the Premchand Raychand Studentship, the late Mr. Harinath De of the Indian Educational Service and Librarian of the Imperial Library at Calcutta (who from his wide linguistic attainments could be described as the Indian Megliabecchi) and the late Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Haraprasad Sastri acting as examiners, the candidate being Professor Praphulla Chandra Ghosh of Presidency College. Since then, from 1912, it has been given a place as an independent subject for the M. A. in the Calcutta University, and a stray candidate or two would appear in it from time to time. Just before the last Great War, before 1914, Dr. Otto Strauss of Kiel was appointed Professor of Comparative Philology in Calcutta, and he taught mainly Sanskrit students; and when he was interned during the war as an enemy subject, the late Prof. Roby Datta took his place. Then we had Professor I. J. S. Taraporewala as the next incumbent of the Comparative Philology chair. In this way in one Indian University at least Linguistics was given the status of an independent subject nearly thirty years ago. Another impetus was given in Calcutta to Linguistics by the inauguration of Pali studies, in the revival of which in Bengal and in India the late Mahamahopadhyaya Satis Chandra Vidyabhushana and some of his colleagues took a leading part. Maharashtra may now be said to have come to the forefront of Pali studies in India, as also Eastern U. P., side by side with Bengal. The preëminence of Gujarat in Prakrit studies, thanks to the living presence of Jainism, formed another factor which joined forces with the revival of Pali in India to prepare the gronnd for historical and comparative study of Indo-Aryan.

Linguistics in connexion with English and Germanic was encouraged in the University of Madras through the initiative of Professor Mark Hunter, and Professor M. Collins was able to inspire work in Dravidian linguistics. A Tamil scholar K. V. Subbaiya essayed in 1909-1911 in the pages of the *Indian Antiquary* a Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Dravidian Languages. The need for a text-book suitable for Indian students of Sanskrit who had to know elements of Comparative Philology was to some extent met by the *Introduction to Comparative Philology* by the late Professor P. D. Gune 1918, a promising scholar of Maharashtra who obtained his training in Linguistics in Germany and whose

untimely death was a great loss to Indian scholarship. But so far nothing serious was taken in hand by Indian scholars, although papers and monographs on special aspects of Indo-Aryan and Dravidian (lexical or morphological) appeared from time to time (e. g. Rai Saheb Yogesh Chandra Ray Vidyanidhi's *Bengali Dictionary* and *Bengali Grammar* published from the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Parishad, in 1912; articles on Bhāsa and his Prakrit by V. S. Sukhtankar; the three numbers of *Dravidic Studies* published from the University of Madras in 1919; etc. etc.)

European scholars in India and abroad (Europe and America) were proceeding with their discoveries in the domain of Indo-European and Indo-Aryan, and first in India and then in England, Grierson was carrying on his work on modern Indian languages, centering round the *Linguistic Survey of India.* The Italian Scholar L. P. Tessitori did some very brilliant work (e. g. *Notes on the Grammar of Old Western Rajasthani* in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1914–1916), but a life of great promise was cut off by his untimely death. Jules Bloch of Paris (author of the *Formation de la Langue marathe*, Paris 1919) and Ralph Lilley Turner then came to the field, and these scholars are the real *gurus* of the present generation of Indians working in the domain of Indian Linguistics.

It was inevitable that the most significant contribution from the present generation of Indian workers in Linguistics would mainly be connected with the Modern Indian Languages. The Linguistics of Vedic and Sanskrit has been the gift of European science, to the world in general and to India in particular, but Indian scholars are not yet properly equipped (at least the average run of them) to make any real contribution to it. This equipment consists not only in a thorough knowledge of Vedic and Sanskrit, which is not wanting in India, but an equally thorough acquaintance with the ancient Indo-European languages and their history, e. g. with Avestan and Old Persian, with Greek, Latin, Gothic and Old English and other Germanic Languages, Old Irish and other Celtic, Old Church Slav, Classical Armenian and the rest, combined with a proper appreciation and assimilation of the present-day comparative and historical method. In addition to this, a working knowledge of German and French in which most of the researches done in the field is enshrined, over and above that of English, is a necessity. Naturally, it will take some time before a tradition of study of these Western Indo-European languages ancient and modern grows up

among Indian scholars,— although a modest beginning has been made through the initiative of individual scholars in some of the Universities. The results and methods of investigation into Indo-European must first of all be fully assimilated; and for that a different orientation towards the problem of the Aryans and their connexion with India and the contribution they made in the evolution of Indian history and civilisation, an orientation freed from all notions of "Aryan" superiority, is of paramount importance. But signs are not wanting that with proper training Indian scholarship during the last twenty-five years has been able to make noteworthy progress in this direction. We can mention, e. g., among a few other contributions of a similar nature, Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh's *Linguistic Introduction to Sanskrit* (Calcutta 1937), which is a slight work of some 164 pages giving a *résumé* of the present-day position of Scientific Linguistics with regard to the evolution of Sanskrit, in which the author has introduced some of his own views and explanations also. The late Dr. Wackernagel of Basel, the eminent author of the great historical grammar of Sanskrit, has expressed this opinion about Dr. Ghosh's book: "Your work brings something entirely new into India and ushers in a real epoch." Earlier his thesis on the nominal and verbal formations in *-p-* of Sanskrit was published in French from Paris (1933). Dr. Ghosh mastered German before he left India for Europe, and in Germany he studied most of the European classical languages, and has thus come fully prepared for important work in the future—like a few other Indian scholars, notably from Bombay. A series of articles comparing Sanskrit with the different ancient Indo-European tongues from the pen of Dr. Ghosh is appearing in the Calcutta Journal *Indian Culture*. Of all the non-Indian Indo-European languages, Iranian in its later Islamic phase as Modern Persian has become almost an Indian language, and in its earlier phases Pahlavi and Avestan it has been long introduced into India by the Parsis ; and thanks to Parsi scholarship, Sanskritists in India, particularly in Bombay, have every opportunity of studying this sister-tongue of Sanskrit, viz. Avestan and of applying the comparative method in this study. It was through the encouragement of the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee that Avestan and Old Persian were introduced into the University of Calcutta when Dr. I. J. S. Taraporewala took the chair of Comparative Philology, and one of the first fruits of his work in popularising Avesta studies among

Sanskritists (a work in which he was anticipated to some extent by Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Vidhusekhara Sastri of Santiniketan) was the publication of his very useful Avesta Reader (Calcutta University 1922); and one of his pupils Dr. Sukumar Sen, now of the Department of Comparative Philology in the University of Calcutta, a versatile linguistician whose work in other domains also requires mention, recently published (University of Calcutta 1941) his *Old Persian Inscriptions of the Achæmenian Emperors*, giving with the original Old Persian texts their Sanskrit *chāyā* with actual or hypothetical Indo-Aryan equivalents and very exhaustive and valuable lexical and grammatical commentaries. This work may be looked upon as the first serious and scientific contribution from an Indian scholar outside of the community to the study of Old Iranian. Other non-Parsi Sanskritists who are also Avestan and Old Persian Scholars whose names can be mentioned are Prof. Kshetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya of the University of Allahabad and Dr. Manilal Patel of Santiniketan and Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan of Bombay, and we can confidently look to some real advance being made by Indian scholars in the field of comparative Indo-Aryan and Iranian studies. I do not mention here the work of Parsi Scholars in the field of pure Iranian. e. g. that of Dhalla, Unvala, and Tavadia, among others. C. R. Sankaran's articles on some Indo-European problems deserve to be noted.

A professorship of Indo-European Linguistics in the Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute at Poona, with Dr. S. M. Katre, the present Director of the Institute, as its first incumbent, is a promise of good work in the immediate future. In Dravidian Linguistics notable work is being done by Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, and mention must be made of R. Narasimhacharya's *History of the Kannada Language* (Mysore 1934) and K. Ramakrishnaiah's *Studies in Dravidian Philology* (Madras University 1935). C. R. Sankaran's papers on the subject are also to be mentioned.

In the field of Austric (Kol or Munda) studies P. O. Bodding's *Material for a Santali Grammar* (two parts, Duma 1922 ff.) is the only mentionable work done in India.

Want of tradition and equipment is thus delaying Indian contribution of worth to the Linguistics of the earlier phase of Indo-Aryan, going back to Indo-European and pre-Indo-European, and naturally Indian scholarship found its proper field in the modern Indian languages. Here we have certain advantages which belong

only to those who are to the manner born. This was the immediate source of the impetus from within; and a strong urge from the outside came with resurgence of the spirit of nationalism which showed itself in India from the first decade of the present century. The *Swadeshi* movement demanded a loving homage to the mother-tongue; and the winning of the Nobel Prize for Literature by Rabindranath Tagore in 1913 put heart into us, that our contribution to pure literature which had its appeal to the whole of humanity did not end with the Vedas and the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, with Bhāsa and Kālidāsa and the early Tamil poets, with Kabīr and the mediaeval Saints. It was not long before the Universities, till now the unapproachable hot-houses of an imported English culture, opened their doors to the Indian Modern Languages to come and take their proper place in the scheme of India's education and culture. Outside the University, societies like the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Parishad, the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā, the Gujarāt Vernacular Society, the Tamil Sangam etc., and various private publishing houses, were doing their good work, publishing texts, lexicons and monographs; and learned societies like the above gradually increased in number, and embraced most of the languages. In 1919 the University of Calcutta under the inspiration of the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee took the lead by instituting Indian Modern Languages as a subject for the M. A. examination. Previous to that, the study of the mother-tongue was made compulsory for Indian students upto the B. A. stage. The ultimate aim being to make the mother-tongue the medium of instruction and examination upto the highest college stage, it was necessary to make it a fit and proper vehicle for ideas, scientific, philosophical and literary; and with this end in view, boards for devising technical terminology were instituted in Calcutta and elsewhere. With all this, the need for a scientific study of the languages in their origin and development was felt as a matter of course; and here, it was realised, there was an opportunity to put to some purpose the methods of linguistic study and observation, learned in India or abroad, either from contributions on the subject by scholars like Grierson, Tessitori, Jules Bloch, and R. L. Turner, or through personal touch with masters of the science in Europe. The result was that during the last decade and a half we have a series of attempts to trace the historical development of Indian languages, which are among the first offerings from the present generation of Indian investigators at the shrine of *Vāg-devī*, the Goddess of Speech, following the initial flower-offering made by Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar some sixty-five years ago. (S. K. Chatterji, *Bengali*,

1926; Banarsidas Jain, *Panjabi*, 1934; L. V. Ramaswami Ayyar, *Malayalam*, 1936; Baburam Saksena, *Awadhi*, 1938; Banikanta Kakati, *Assamese*, 1941; A. N. Narasimhia, *Kannada as in the Oldest Inscriptions*, 1941; and Sumitra Mangesh Katre, *Konkani*, 1942; besides partial studies—not wholly historical and comparative—of *Bhojpuriya*, by Uday Narayan Tiwari; of *Noakhali Bengali*, by Gopal Haldar; of *Chittagong Bengali*, by Krishnapada Goswami; of *Braj-bhakha*, by Dhirendra Varma; of *Lahndi* (*Hindki or Western Panjabi*) by Siddheshwar Varma; of *Maithili*, by Subhadra Jha; and of *Dakni Hindustani*, by S. Mohiuddin Qadri; and a few others).

A new department of Linguistic studies has been opened up for Indian scholars by Dr. Prabodh Candra Bagchi who, in his edition of two Sanskrit-Chinese Lexicons of the 8th century A. D., has treated the Sanskrit and Chinese vocables as given in these works with all their linguistic implications. In this way we have the inauguration of linguistic work in the domain of Sino-Indian Studies.

Phonetics as it is now being studied in Europe and America has been given its proper place in linguistic investigation, and a phonetic survey of Indian spoken dialects has been taken in hand by both individual scholars and collectively through the auspices of societies—Jammu (under Professor Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, one of the most brilliant of Indian linguisticians of the present day, who has made the phonetic survey of the speeches of his own area—Kashmir—a most fruitful subject of research), Lahore (Dr. Banarsidas Jain), Allahabad (Dr. Baburam Saksena), Poona (Dr. Sumitra Mangesh Katre of the Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute), Hyderabad-Deccan (Dr. Mohiuddin Qadri), Mysore (which has the distinction of bringing out the first journal of phonetics in India under the auspices of a Society formed in the University), Ernakulam (Professor L. V. Ramaswami Ayyar) and Calcutta (from where a number of Calcutta "University Phonetic Studies" have appeared) forming centres of phonetic study and research at the present day.

Though not always strictly philological, editing and publication of old texts, and compilation of dictionaries have given a great impetus to Indian Linguistics. In line with the great works of Fallon (Hindustani), Platts (Hindustani), Gundert (Malayalam), Kittel (Kannada), Molesworth (Marathi) and other classics of Indian lexicography, we may mention the dictionaries of Jnanedramohan Das (Bengali—in second edition), Haripada Banerji (Ben-

gali—still progressing), Gopal Chandra Praharaj (Oriya), Syamsundar Das and others (Hindi), Denys S. Bray (Brahui) and Deveswar Chaliha and others (Assamese), besides the great lexicons of Tamil, of Sinhalese and of Panjabi taken in hand respectively by the University of Madras, the Dictionary Committee of the Colombo Museum, and the University of the Punjab, all of which have been completed or started during the last twenty-five years. A rigorously philological dictionary like that of Nepali by R. L. Turner (London 1931) has not yet been achieved by any Indian scholar. Dr. S. M. Katre's word-index in his work on Konkani follows this style.

Text-books and books of an introductory character have been in demand, and following Gune's book mentioned above, works have come from Indian scholars which are generally quite good (although a little amateuristic in some cases) and have partly met this demand. Thus we have Dr. I. J. S. Taraporewala's *Elements of the Science of Language* (Calcutta University, 1932) which is the most comprehensive work of its kind so far produced in India ; and, besides, several other works in the different Indian languages have appeared,—two in Bengali (one by Hemanta Kumar Sarkar, the other by Dr. Sukumar Sen—the latter one of the best short introductions to Linguistics written in our country), three in Hindi (respectively by Nalini Mohan Sanyal, by Mangaldev Sastri, and by Syamsundar Das and Padma Narayan Acharya—not taking note of two other works specifically on Hindi by Syamsundar Das and by Dhirendra Varma) and one in Urdu (by Dr. S. Mohiuddin Qadri). There is still room for a standard and comprehensive work on General Linguistics for Indian students which ought to be taken up by some Indian linguistician. In the meanwhile an attempt has recently been made to give a survey of the history of the Aryan speech in India from Old Indo-Aryan onwards (the inspiration has been from Prof. Jules Bloch's masterly work *L'Indo-Aryen*) and of the evolution of Hindi as a 'National Language' for India with all its attendant problems (S. K. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, Ahmedabad 1942).

It will not be possible to detail out the more important articles and papers on different aspects of Indian Linguistics which have appeared from Indian scholars during the last twenty-five years—there is the limitation of space, and the limitation imposed upon the present reviewer through lack of proper subject-indexes of journal articles. But it may be said that Old and Middle Indo-Aryan

have not been side-tracked by Indian linguisticians, who are trying to tackle some of their outstanding problems. The impact of non-Aryan on Indo-Aryan—the place of the non-Aryan substrata in the evolution of the Aryan speech in India—is one such problem: and this also has engaged our attention, but here too the equipment of North Indian workers (with their general lack of a knowledge of Dravidian, Austric and Sino-Tibetan) is quite inadequate; South Indian workers with their knowledge of Dravidian are in a much better position, at least for one aspect of this line of research. The place and significance of the Prakrits (including Pali) in the line of linguistic development is another problem; as also the immediate sources of the New Indo-Aryan dialects. The working out of Primitive Dravidian—of an *Ādi-Drāviḍa* speech—a **Dramiz-col* or *Ur-Drawidisch*—is one of the desiderata in Dravidian Linguistics; similarly of an *Ādi-Kolla-bhāṣā*—of a **Kaḍo-kaji* or *Ur-kol*, and of an '*Ur-austrische*' speech, for Kol and other Austric Linguistics. After the study of words and forms, that of syntax or word-order has also been taken up—e. g. by Dr. Sukumar Sen for Indo-Aryan in all its three stages Old, Middle and New (the last mainly through his own mother-tongue Bengali). Intensive study of the vocabulary of Indo-Aryan at a particular stage is promising to be of very great value—e. g. the enquiry into the language of the Mahābhārata (coming in the train of the Critical Edition of the greatest book of India and one of the greatest of mankind undertaken by the Bhandarkar Research Institute, forming a *magnum opus* of the first order in recent Indian scholarship) taken up by Dr. S. M. Katre, and by E. D. Kulkarni in his study of the *Verbs of Movement and their Variants in the Critical Edition of the Ādi-Parvan* (Poona 1941).

We have to take into note the many new research associations with their bulletins and monographs, most of them of a high order, which have been established at different centres to meet the requirements of scientific expression in Indological studies engendered by a veritable intellectual and cultural renaissance during the last twenty-five years; and these bulletins and monographs deal with the story of human endeavour in India, in political history, in economics, and in the domain of the spirit; and language naturally finds its proper place in this attempt to narrate or unravel this story. But special reference should be made, *à propos* a survey of linguistic work in India during the last quarter of a century, to the *Linguistic Society of India* which was formally started at Lahore in 1928 on the occasion of the All-India Oriental

Conference held there, with the late Dr. A. C. Woolner, then Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Punjab, helping us to establish it. The *Linguistic Society of India* has since been transferred to Calcutta, and although its membership is small and its resources are very meagre, it has been trying for the past few years with the help of its journal *Indian Linguistics* to serve as a clearing house for all serious work in the subject in India. The Languages and Linguistics Sections of the All-India Oriental Conference (first inaugurated at Poona in 1919, with Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar as its General President), which is held every two years, have for the last twenty years and more formed a common meeting ground for workers in Indian languages and in Indian Linguistics.

The record of linguistic research by Indian workers is yet far from rivalling that of our Western *pathi-kṛtas*, our European path-makers and teachers; but with Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar at our head, and Rabindranath Tagore and Asutosh Mookerjee as our two great inspirers (Rabindranath's own contribution to the subject through his studies in Bengali linguistics is not negligible, and Asutosh made serious work possible first in Bengal and then through Bengal largely in the rest of India), a good beginning has been made, and we can look forward to proceed to higher and higher achievement, with *Excelsior* as our watchword.

A SURVEY OF RESEARCH IN INDIAN SOCIOLOGY IN RELATION TO HINDU *DHARMA-ŚĀSTRAS* (1917-1942)

By

PANDHARINATH VALAVALKAR

We begin our *Survey* with a work which is as valuable a contribution to the interpretation of Hindu social philosophy as it has been overlooked by its students-which is probably due to the fact that the title of the book does not convey any idea of its very close relation to Indian thought. The book is Urwick's *The Message of Plato : A Re-Interpretation of the Republic*[1].

In this book, Urwick undertakes the very bold task of proving that Plato's 'The Republic' is based largely upon ancient Indian social philosophy. The book, says he, " is intended for the general reader. ....I have therefore, omitted...sections on the origin of the doctrine of Ideas,...a long inquiry into the channels by which Indian thought penetrated Greece,...a detailed comparison between the Indian and Greek metaphysical speculations..." (Preface, p. viii). The author has used Bhagwan Das's *The Science of Social Organization* (first edition of 1910) in the introductory part of the book.

Part one of *The Message* discusses Plato's 'Western ancestry' i. e. the Socratic doctrine, and his 'Eastern ancestry' i. e. the Vedic view of human life. After first stating the Socratic doctrine, Urwick pointedly asks :

" Such was Plato's master...Such were the quest, the character and the faith of the man by whom the Platonic teaching was inspired...Whence were they derived ? From his Greek predecessors

---

1. By E. J. Urwick, pp. xii + 263. Methuen, London. 1920. Professor Urwick was Director of the (then) School of Sociology and Professor of Social Philosophy in London University, Tooke Professor of Economic Science and President of Morley Memorial College, London, and is now Director of Social Sciences in Toronto University, Canada. He has also written *A Philosophy of Social Progress*, *The Social God*, and *Luxury and Waste*.

Of the sociologists mentioned in this *Survey*, hardly any seem to have noticed Urwick's *The Message*, for it does not find a mention even in the bibliographies of their books though it was published as early as in 1920. Indeed, it had also escaped the attention of the present writer himself, till very recently, when Prof. Urwick himself wrote to the writer drawing his attention to it.

and contemporaries? .... The quest and life and faith... were as un-Greek as anything could possibly be... That was one of the reasons why the Greeks killed Socrates .... The Platonic Socrates is never tired of asserting that he stands alone; that he differs from both predecessors and contemporaries, in thought, in aim, in interest, in method, in belief... In reference to quest of Socrates, his character and his faith I will be content to let the resemblance to the quest and character and faith of the ancient Indian sages speak for itself. If any one make himself familiar with old Indian wisdom... will shake himself free from the academic attitude and the limiting Western conception of philosophy, and will then read Plato's dialogues, he will hardly fail to realize that both are occupied with the self-same search, inspired by the same faith...Definite identities of peculiar doctrine are more marked in some dialogues than in others, most of all perhaps in the Ontological dialogues such as *The Timaeus*" (pp. 12–14).

The fundamental ideas of Hindu thought which find close resemblance to Plato's ideas in *The Republic*,–and therefore are called by Urwick 'The Eastern Ancestry of Plato's thought'–are as follows: The pathway of human soul through life may be pictured as containing two distinct segments or arcs, a lower and a higher. The lower arc or pathway covers his life as a social being–as a member of a social, industrial, political and economic group. The higher arc represents the path of the free 'super-social' soul, now not bound by any social, economic, political or civic duty, but by its relation to the supreme reality which is above all worlds.

In the lower arc–called *Pravṛtti-Mārga*–there are three faculties guiding the conduct of human life, viz. desire (*tamas*), emotion (*rajas*), and intelligence (*sattva*). If these are ordered aright, man is able to reach the highest level of excellence as a good social being–as a father or brother or son or employer or servant or citizen or administrator or soldier. Yet, here, our horizon is bounded by the lower arc which is but a shadow of the real excellence of a soul which lies in the higher are. In the higher arc also–which is called the *Nivṛtti-Mārga*–there are these three qualities, but they may now be called love, faith and wisdom, as the perfect forms of which desire, emotion and intelligence are earthly copies on the lower arc. Unlike the latter qualities, however, each quality of the higher arc is equally good and has, for its end, complete excellence. Thus, the end of love is selfless devotion to god, without the thought of self or of any rewar d for self; the end of faith is the attainment of powers to be

used only in the service of the good resulting in ceaseless activity for others without any care about consequences: the end of wisdom is the attainment of knowledge of God as He is, in or behind all created forms, resulting in discrimination or discernment in all things. Evidently, this path can be followed only by renouncing all desires, interests and attachments of the separate self. Hence it is called the path of renunciation or of detachment or of liberation (*mukti*).

Between these two arcs, the difference is not of mere degrees. Powers which were dormant and unused in the lower arc are brought into play in the higher arc. Only the soul which is fully prepared, trained and made perfect upon the lower path can rise up to level of the higher path. The higher arc was called the path of *Nous* by Plato; the Hindu calls it that of the *Puruṣa* or *Ātman*. The two arcs represent two different realms of activity—the one of the world, worldly, quasi-real, transitory, fluctuating between *relative* evil and *relative* good, pleasure and pain, knowledge and ignorance, and hence is the Path of Pursuit; the other not of the world, religious, absolutely real, eternal, unfluctuating and leading straight onward to perfect light, and hence is the Path of Liberation or Renunciation (*Mukti*).

The lower path is that of self-development in all its forms, i. e. of the realization of any and all emotional, aesthetic or scientific ends and of any or all interests in results. But in the higher path there is no self, in the sense of ego, left to satisfy or to reward. We must literally lose our individual self to find out the real self. Nevertheless, though the upper path alone is wholly the life of true reality, the lower one is not wholly unreal or illusory; and though life of renunciation is wholly selfless, life of pursuit is not purely selfish. For on the path of pursuit, there are reflected, as it were, all the forms of good which have their reality on the upper path of liberation; and so all these forms of good have a relative reality on the lower path.

Now, Plato's conception, arguments and conclusions in *The Republic* are not only remarkably parallel but " in most cases identical " with such Hindu view (p. 27). Even the language is extraordinarily similar and the metaphors are identical. And the semi-technical terms he has coined " serve excellently as translations of the corresponding technical terms in Sanskrit " (p. 28). Thus, *Tamas*, *Rajas* and *Sattva* have equivalents in *Epithumia*, *Thumos* and *Logistikon*; Vaiśya, Kṣatriya and Brāhmaṇa classes

correspond to Plato's Traders, Auxiliaries and Guardians which represent the three qualities; Plato's *Nous* to *Ātmā*; his distinction between phenomenal knowledge and wisdom to that between *Vidyā* and *Adhyātma-vidyā*; his transition from the lower to the higher arc with *Vairāgya*; his doctrines of Reincarnation, of Recollections (*Anamnesis*), of Eternal Ideas have astonishingly close counter-parts in Vedānta doctrines; and finally, his *Dikaiosune* (Righteousness) to *Dharma*.

Urwick then proceeds to discuss each of the ten Books of *The Republic*, demonstrating further close resemblances between Plato and Hindu social philosophy, and also emphasising how all these ideas were dissimilar to the current Greek thought of his times. For example, in explaining the nature of *Dikaiosune* (Justice), he points out that the perfectly good state will contain these four cardinal virtues, viz.: 'Prudence'—to be discovered in the Guardians, in the council, of knowledge, etc.; 'Fortitude'—among the brave fighting class, the Auxiliaries; 'Temperance,'—a kind of mastery of good quality over bad one, and as such implying a constant conflict between pairs of good and bad qualities which is found in the Traders; and, 'Justice'—which represents the universal principle viz. that every individual and every class should hold to one occupation only. Meddling with any other function than one's own is injustice. "This extraordinary and entirely un-Greek definition of *Dikaiosune* is explained by the meaning of *Dharma* " (p. 74). The account of the immortality of the soul and the ' law of reincarnation ' occurring in Book X of *The Republic* have unmistakable similarities to Hindu conceptions of immortality, rebirth and *Karma* doctrine.

The similarity between the Indian and the Platonic conception of the ultimate divine reality in Bks. VI-VII is also very significant. In most religions it is blasphemous to assert that the Divine Being is not a personal God; but in the Vedānta any other conception of God would be impossible. Personality belongs to the 'lower nature' of God; but the Supreme Being, *Brahman*, the source of all life and reality, transcends personality. Its essence cannot be described or conceived by human intellect—it is the Unmanifest, the Unqualified, beyond Being and also Not-Being, etc. And Plato's conception of reality is exactly similar. "I do not think," says Urwick, " there is a single phase or conception in Plato's account of *Nous* which does not find its exact parallel in the Vedic teachings" (p. 138). So again, Plato's account of the education of the Philosopher is analogous to the Vedic *Jñāna-Yoga*.

In the concluding chapter of *The Message*, Urwick complains that Plato has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by the West because it is so much interested in the material side of human life —in politics, in the machinery of social welfare or reform, in science which is expected to cure disease or prolong life or supply material comforts. Thus, in spite of the clear and emphatic assertion of Plato that " Our astronomy will have nothing to do with the fretted sky, but will leave the visible stars alone," a philoshpher like Bosanquet would make the extraordinary assertion that the modern discovery of the planet Neptune would have been dear to the heart of Plato ! (p. 223). Evidently, the West, says Urwick, has subordinated even philosophy and spiritual life to the politics and the science and the civilization in which it believes ; it is concerned with the Path of Pursuit, of wordly life ; therefore, it wants to give a colour of practical politics to Plato's originally spiritual thesis.

Of course, both the Paths are good, though in very different degree ; both are necessary, though at different stages of life ; indeed one must pass and train oneself through the former in order to be fit to undertake the higher journey. But, we must never forget that it is through the higher journey alone that our final salvation and final achievement of human life can be possible.

The Message of Plato is written in forceful and charming style, and, as an interpretation coming from one who is not born in Hinduism, must have a special appeal to us in the East as well as to the West at a time when some of our own people have been vociferous in decrying the Hindu social ideas as savage, uncivilized, narrow, secular, socially disintegrating, and as inventing and devising clever interpretations merely to justify unhealthy and even pernicious social practices !

It is very difficult to take a brief and connected review of the works of B. K. Sarkar, who has contributed profusely to Indian sociology, writing on numerous topics with encyclopaedic learning. Here we are not concerned with his works which deal with the present and the historical past of India and the world conditions, but only with his interpretations of Indian social thought based on *Dharmaśāstras* and published since 1917—viz., *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* : Vol. II—Bk. II,[2] Pts. i and ii ; and Vol. I—*Introdubiion to*

2. Pp. 240 Pub. by the Pāṇinī Office, Allahabad, 1921 and 1926.

Hindu Positivism;[3] *The Futurism of Young Asia*, later appearing as *The Sociology of Races, Cultures and Human Progress*,[4] and *Creative India*[5]. The difficulty of summarizing Sarkar's views is great, particularly because his ramifications of speculation have covered, as Ghoshal says,[6] " the entire field of man and his creations and conquests. ... is the philosophy of cultural and social dynamics covering almost the whole life of man ... through some eighteen thousand pages or so. "

Sarkar has tried to counteract, fairly successfully, the one-sided notions current about Indian culture—for which Max Müller and Schopenhauer are mainly responsible. Max Müller declared that Indian thought was mainly directed to other-wordly, spiritual and metaphysical problems, and to that extent was abstract, and that it disregarded the practical issues and struggles of man's day-to-day life. Schopenhauer, on the other hand, saw the philosophy of quietism, pacifism, inactivity, non-resistence, in the Upaniṣads and gave it prominence. But, objects Sarkar, both these views are based on a partial and one-sided study (*Futurism*, pp. 7 ff.). India had made immense and noteworthy achievements in the field of positive and practical sciences from the Vedic period down to 1600 (*Positive Background*, Vol. I).

Dharma and religion, are, to Sarkar, synonymous terms, and both mean " a synthesis of societal and cultural functions, interests and values......It is in the milieu of sociality, solidarism, harmony or equilibrium in the domain of human experience, whether individual or collective, that we have to move while dealing with the substance of *dharma*." Taken in such a wide implication, *dharma* cannot but be indefinite, elastic, and possess " a delightfully and often dangerous vagueness." It is therefore that our *Dharma-Śāstra* writers have, in their works, devoted attention to all the aspects of man's life and conduct—physical and mental, individual and social. We may, for purposes of academic study, isolate and

3. Pp. 770. „ Chuckervartty, Chatterjee & Co., Calcutta. 1937.
4. Pp. 400. „ „ „ „ 1939.
5. Pp. 725. „ „ „ „ „
6. I have made use of S. K. Ghoshl's *Sarkarism*, (pp, vi + 57, 1939, Chuckervartty, Chatterjee & Co., Calcutta), for this present summary, in view of the brief time as well as space at my disposal.

Since the above was written, there has appeared another book on Sarkar, entitled *The Social and Economic Ideas of B. K. Sarkar*, Edited by B. Dass in colaboration with thirteen scholars, pp. 690, Chuckervertty, Chatterjee & Co., Ltd., Calcutta.

separate the diverse elements of the complex whole which are included in the all-embracing term *Dharma* or religion; but we must never lose sight of the fact that at bottom they form a synthesis, a whole, and their isolation, if taken absolutely, would lead to the same result as the isolation of the bloodless corpusels from a living body would lead to dead matter, without true reality or life in them!

Radhakrishnan's contribution towards the interpretation and understanding of the Hindu social philosophy is extremely lucid, and finds outlet in many of his works, though it is particularly specially stated in his *The Heart of Hindusthān*[7], *The Hindu View of Life*[8] and *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*[8a]. To summarize this writer is to lose the great charm and brilliance which his original presentation possesses and therefore I shall here content myself with giving the reader a few excerpts from these works so as to kindle his appetite for further reading into these and other works of Radhakrishnan:—

The complex of institutions and influences which shape the moral feeling and character of the people is called the *dharma*, which is a fundamental feature of the Hindu religion (*The Heart of Hindusthān* p. 17). The *dharma* is a code of conduct supported by the general conscience of the people. It is not subjective in the sense that the conscience of the individual imposes it, nor external in the sense that the law enforces it (*ibid.* p. 18). *Dharma* does not force men into virtue, but trains them for it. It is not a fixed code of mechanical rules, but a living spirit which grows and moves in response to the development of the society (*ibid.* p. 18). The *dharma* or the social life has continued the same in principle for over 4,000 years in spite of divergent religious creeds, dynastic wars, and political feuds. The living continuity of Indian life is to be seen not in her political history but in her cultural and social life (*ibid.* p. 18).

The *dharma* has two sides, which are interdependent, the individual and the social. The *varṇāśrama dharma*, which deals with the classes of society and the stages of the individual life, develops the details (*ibid.* p. 19). The caste rules relate to the social functions of individuals. Man's nature can be developed only by a concentration of his personality at a particular point in the social order.

---

7. By Sir S. Radhakrishnan. 3rd. Ed. pp, 151. G. A. Natesan, Madras. 1936.
8. Upton Lectures, at Oxford. Pp. 153. Allen & Unwin, London, 1927.
8a. Pp. 396. Oxford University Press, 1939. 2nd. Ed. 1940.

Since human beings show one or other of the three aspects of mental life in a greater degree the '*dvijas*' or the twice-born are distinguished into the three classes of men of thought, men of feeling, and men of action. Those in whom no one quality is particularly developed are the *Śūdras.* The four castes correspond to the intellectual, militant, industrial, and unskilled workers, who are all members of one organic whole (*ibid.* p. 21).

The ideal of the Hindu *dharma* is to make all men Brahmins, all people prophets (*ibid.* p. 22). Man has no wings to soar to the heights; he has therefore to be content with scaling them through effort and pain, step by step. The Hindu social organisation embodies this graduated scheme (*ibid.* p. 22).

To-day, after so many centuries of Buddhism and Christianity, when a civilised race comes into contact with a backward one, it does not care to understand the mentality of the latter, but practises cruel methods of conquest and subjection, so that the backward races, if they are left with eyes to weep with, spend laborious days and sleepless nights cursing God, because He had allowed these civilisers to get into their lands. The Aryans of India accepted the natives into their fold and helped them to get rid of their habits of dirt and drunkenness, lead clean lives and worship the one living God. When the original inhabitants were found worshipping serpents, the Aryans told them that there was a greater God than the serpent-god, the *Nāgeśvara,* the Lord of Serpents, or Krishna (*ibid.* pp. 24–25).

It is clear that Hinduism is a process, not a result : a growing tradition, not a fixed revelation. It never shut off by force wisdom anywhere, for there are no distinctions of mine and thine in the Kingdom of Spirit (*ibid.* p. 27).

The term " *dharma* " is one of complex significance. It stands for all those ideals and purposes, influences and institutions that shape the character of man both as an individual and as a member of society. It is the law of right living, the observance of which secures the double object of happiness on earth and salvation (*ibid.* pp. 28–29).

The Hindu thinkers are conscious of the great gulf that separates the actual nature of man, which is bad, from the ideal, which seems to be well-nigh impossible. The consciousness of the great distance between the actual and the ideal does not tempt them to

distort the ideal itself. It would be a blasphemy against the spirit in us that shall not be forgiven (*ibid.* pp. 34–35). The *Mahābhārata* says :—" The governing consideration should be *śīla* or conduct, and the first Manu has declared that there is no point in distinctions of caste, if character is not considered" (*ibid.* p. 48).

To say that social service is unknown to the Hindus is to utter a bold untruth. Much capital is made out of the treatment of the untouchables. It is not remembered that a free India rendered them much greater service than what other free countries even in recent times have done for their backward classes. How have the superior nations civilized the Tasmanian and the Australian aborigines, certain Maori peoples and North American Indian tribes ? They generally refine them into extinction, and where that is not possible, they sink them into the slough of vice and crime worse than any normal expressions of savage life. If the Kaffir has multiplied under the British protection and the Javanese under the Dutch, if the populations of Straits Settlements and British India have not vanished before their civilizers, it is because a good God has put them in a climate unfavourable to the civilizers. The tropics can never become the habitat of the Europeans. They can be held but not peopled by them. But for the limits set by Nature, the history of the tropical regions would have been different. From the time the Aryans met the peoples of a lower grade of civilization, they devised ways and means by which the different portions of the population could develop in social and spiritual directions (*ibid.* p. 51).

Now that things are in a more settled condition, the Hindu leaders are reiterating the central truth that the least of all men has a soul and need not be considered past all power to save (*ibid.* p. 53). The Hindu *dharma* has room for all kinds of men, the dispassionate old who have retired from the business of life and the eager pushful young who are keen on worldly success. The four castes and orders are not intended to be special moulds into which the Indian people are thrown, but forms capable of embracing the whole of humanity (*ibid.* p. 56).

The doctrine of *Māyā* is supposed to repudiate the reality of the world and thus make all ethical relations meaningless (*The Hindu View of Life* p. 61). *Mokṣa* or release of any one individual does not bring about the destruction of the world but only the displacement of a false outlook by a true one, *avidyā* by *vidyā.*

When the illusion of the mirage is dissipated by scientific knowledge, the illusion stands there though it is no longer able to tempt us. The world is not so much denied as reinterpreted (*ibid.* pp. 65-66).

There are divine potentialities in even the worst of men, the everlasting arms of God underneath the worst sinners. No one is really beyond hope. Every sinner has a future even as every saint has had a past. No one is so good or so bad as he imagines. The great souls of the world address themselves to the task of rousing the divine possibilities in the publicans and the sinners. The doctrine of *Karma* is sometimes interpreted as implying a denial of human freedom which is generally regarded as the basis of all ethical values. But when rightly viewed the law does not conflict with the reality of freedom. It is the principle of science which displaces belief in magic or the theory that we can manipulate the forces of the world at our pleasure. The course of nature is determined not by the passions and prejudices of personal spirits lurking behind it but by the operation of immutable laws (*ibid.* pp. 71-72).

Divine laws cannot be evaded. They are not so much imposed from without as wrought into our natures. Sin is not so much a defiance of God as a denial of soul, not so much a violation of law as a betrayal of self. We carry with us the whole of our past. It is an ineffaceable record which time cannot blur nor death erase (*ibid.* p. 73).

The critic who urges that belief in *Karma* makes religious life, prayer and worship impossible has not a right understanding of it (*ibid.* p. 74). *Karma* reckons with the material or the context in which each individual is born. While it regards the past as determined, it allows that the future is only conditioned. The spiritual element in man allows him freedom within the limits of his nature. Man is not a mere mechanism of instincts. The spirit in him can triumph over the automatic forces that try to enslave him (*ibid.* p. 75).

We can use the material with which we are endowed to promote our ideals. The cards in the game of life are given to us. We do not select them. They are traced to our past *Karma*, but we can call as we please, lead what suit we will, and as we play, we gain or lose (*ibid.* p. 75). The theory of *Karma* allows man the freedom to use the material in the light of his knowledge (*ibid.* pp. 75-76),

Dharma, formed from the root *dhṛ*, to hold, means that which holds a thing and maintains it in being. Every form of life, every group of men, has its *dharma*, which is the law of its being. *Dharma* or virtue is conformity with the truth of things ; *Adharma* or vice is opposition to it. Moral evil is disharmony with the truth which encompasses and controls the world (*ibid.* p. 78).

Marriage for the Hindu is a problem and not a datum. Except in the pages of fiction we do not have a pair agreeing with each other in everything, tastes and temper, ideals and interests. Irreducible peculiarities there will always be, and the task of the institution of marriage is to use these differences to promote a harmonious life. Instincts and passions are the raw material which are to be worked up into an ideal whole. Though there is some choice with regard to our mates, there is a large element of chance in the best of marriages (*ibid.* pp. 84-85). That marriage is successful which transforms a chance mate into a life companion. Marriage is not the end of the struggle, it is but the beginning of a strenuous life where we attempt to realise a larger ideal by subordinating our private interests and inclinations (*ibid.* p. 85).

The perfectly ethical marriage is the monogamous one (*ibid* p. 85). In the absence of absolute perfection we have to be content with approximations. We need not, however, confound the higher with the lower (*ibid.* p. 85-86)

Paradoxical as it may seem, the system of caste is the outcome of tolerance and trust. Though it has now degenerated into an instrument of oppression and intolerance, though it tends to perpetuate inequality and develop the spirit of exclusiveness, these unfortunate effects are not the central motives of the system. If the progressive thinkers of India had the power, as they undoubtedly have the authority, they would transform the institution out of recognition (*ibid.* p. 93).

Today democracy is so interpreted as to justify not only the very legitimate aspiration to bring about a more equitable distribution of wealth, but also the increasing tendency for a levelling down of all talent (*ibid.* p. 114). While we should remove the oppressive restrictons, dispel the ignorance of the masses, increase their self-respect, and open to them opportunities of higher life, we should not be under illusion that we can abolish the distinctions of the genius and the fool, the able organiser and the submissive worker. Modern democracies tend to make us all mere "human beings,"

but such beings exist nowhere (*ibid.* p. 114). Democracy is not the standardising of everyone so as to obliterate all peculiarity. We cannot put our souls in uniform, That would be dictatorship. Democracy requires the equal right of all to the development of such capacity for good as nature has endowed them with (*ibid.* p, 116).

Hinduism is a movement, not a position : a process, not a result ; a growing tradition, not a fixed revelation (*ibid.* p. 129). After a long winter of some centuries, we are to-day in one of the creative periods of Hinduism. We are beginning to look upon our ancient faith with fresh eyes. We feel that our society is in a condition of unstable equilibrium. There is much wood that is dead and diseased that has to be cleared away. Leaders of Hindu thought and practice are convinced that the times reguire, not a surrender of the basic principles of Hinduism, but a restatement of them with special reference to the needs of a more complex and mobile social order. Such an attempt will only be the repetition of process which has occurred a number of times in the history of Hinduism. The work of readjustment is in process. Growth is slow when roots are deep. But those who light a little candle in the darkness will help to make the whole sky aflame (*ibid.* p. 130).

There is little in Hindu thought to support the view that one has to attain spiritual freedom by means of a violent rupture with ordinary life. On the other hand, it lays down that we must pass through the normal life conscientiously and with knowledge, work out its values, and accept its enjoyments (*Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, p. 352). Dharma gives coherence and direction to the different activities of life...It is the complete rule of life, the harmony of the whole man who finds a right and just law of his living. It tells us that while our life is in the first instance for our own satisfaction, it is more essentially for the community and most of all for that universal self which is in each of us and all beings. Ethical life is the means to spiritual freedom, as well as its expression on earth (*ibid.* p. 353).

The fourfold scheme of the social classes of the *varṇas* is democratic in the truest senses of the word : (1) It insists on the spiritual equality of all men. It assumes that within every human creature there is a self which has the right to grow in its own way, to find itself, and make its life a full and satisfied image and instrument of its being. (2) It makes for individuality in the positive sense. Individuality is attained not through an escape from limitations

but through the willing acceptance of obligations. (3) It points out that all work is socially useful and from an economic standpoint equally important. (4) Social justice is not a scheme of rights but of opportunities. It is wrong to assume that democracy requires all men to be alike. Equality refers to opportunity and not to capacity. While it recognises that men are unequal in scale and quality, it insists that every human being shall have the right and the opportunity to contribute to human achievement, as far as his capacity goes. Society must be so organised as to give individuals sufficient scope to exercise their natural energies without being interfered with by others. (5) The essence of democracy is consideration for others. Freedom for the individual means restrictions on absolute power. No one class can make unlimited claims. (6) The general tendency of men of all classes to strive to the summit is due to the impression that the position at the top is one of pleasure, profit and power. But in the Hindu scheme life becomes more difficult as we rise higher (*ibid.* pp. 367–370).

S. C. Sarkar's *Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India* (*Pre-Buddhistic Age*)[9] is divided into two parts : Part I deals with building activities, furniture, dress, costume, etc. of that age ; and Part II deals with matters of much more direct interest to the sociologist. Brother–sister and father–daughter marriages were not quite uncommon in Vedic society, though gradually they came to be regarded as incestuous. Levirate (*Niyoga*) and other practices indicate that at one time brothers of a family had one wife (pp. 74–80). Widow–burning must have been existing then as in many other primitive Indo–Germanic races in Asia and Europe though there are very few traces of it in the Vedas. On the other hand the Vedic widow could remarry by regular rites. Indeed, even a married woman could discard the first marriage and remarry another person of her choice. Polygamy was prevalent.

Child–marriage was unknown ; in fact, both the parties to marriage were in fullness of youth, and free love–matches could take place (pp. 91–5). Women had great social freedom ; they attended the *Sabhā* (assembly) and mixed freely with the youth of the village. There was little parental control over marriages of sons and daughters (pp. 95–97). The new daughter–in–law became the mistress of the house and the parents–in–law were subordinate to

9. By S. C. Sarkar. Pp. v + 225. Ox. Uni. Press, London 1928.

her control (p. 97). Descriptions of courting, wooing, go-betweens, match-makings, lovers meeting at festive gatherings, etc. speak of great freedom of choice for the young man and girl (pp. 98-101). Aryans and Dasyus could intermarry, not to speak of intermarriage among the three *Varṇas.*

The woman has been mainly conceived as a wife and a mother, and this has largely determined her social position. Her speeial sphere was the home, "though, from vedic ages onwards, at different times she has passed out of her groove, and lived a much fuller life" (pp. 103-104). The daughters were as well cared for as sons, could join the merriments of the village youth with whom they swung in "green and white swings" under the trees, with the music of lute, etc. They could remain unmarried without any social penalty, and couid inherit father's wealth (pp. 107-108). Both the wife as well as the daughter could enjoy the fullest privileges of the highest education. A woman is ever in a stage of marriage, so to speak—"as a child, with Soma or some other deity of abstractions, as a young maiden,-with the Arts personified, and then finally with her human husband" (p. 112). She could not only take part in debates, teach, follow her husband through all the stages of his intellectual and spiritual development, but could also share his martial glory, as Mudgalānī-Indrasenā did.

The last section of the book deals with the cases of incestuous marriage between brother-sister, parent-child, etc., and compares them with Puraṇic evidence. Regarding widow-marriage, there is meagre evidence in the Vedas, but polygamous marriages are referred to.

Dutt's *Origin and Growth of Caste in India*[10] is intended to present a comprehensive history of caste in the successive stages of Indian History, and "the fundamental principles of social psychology which have been at work behind the apparently diverse and sometimes inexplicable manifestations of caste-spirit, with regard to various institutions of Hindu society" (Preface p. vi). Discussing the theories of Senart, Risley, Gait, Ketkar, Nesfield (ch. i), he observes that the most important factors in the development of caste in India were the racial struggle between the Aryans and non-

10. By N. K. Dntt. pp. xii × 310. Vol. I (*C.* B. C. 2000—300). Kegan Paul, London: and, The Book Co., Calcutta. 1931.

Aryans, the superiority claimed by the priestly class, the natural desire to follow heredity in occupation, the natural disinclination to marry outside one's own folk, absence in Vedic and Epic times of strong political power wielding supremacy over a large area and crushing tribal differences by enforcing uniform laws and customs, the spirit of compromise with which the Hindu submitted to his given position due to his faith in the law of *Karma* and finally the abnormal development of Brahmanical rituals ensuring the position of the Brāhmaṇas as the custodians of religion and culture.

This first volume deals with caste in the Vedic period, the Brāhmaṇa period and the Sūtra period, based on detailed study of and evidence collected from the three respective groups of literature. In the Vedic period (*c*. B. C. 2000–1400) priesthood (Brāhmaṇa) had already become a hereditary profession, and had secured religious power especially through the institution of *Purohita*, the domestic priest. Yet, instances like those of Viśvāmitra and Devāpi and several others show that the Brāhmaṇa class had not been separated from the rest and that a person with exceptional abilities could be admitted to the class (pp. 45–49). There are indications of a struggle for supremacy between the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya classes. Professional classes had begun to arise, though, generally, a member of any class could take up any occupation, without losing honour or dignity. Greater class-segregation was operative, however, between the Aryans and the non-Aryans who must have come to be called the Śūdras. Yet, there was no distinction of food and drink between these four classes. So again, there were few restrictions of exogamic nature regarding marriage, and none for intermarriage (pp. 67–70).

During the Brāhmaṇa period (*c*. B. C. 1400–800), there arose more and more of special rules of conduct and different practices or ceremonies for each of the classes, turning them into less mobile groups with the stronger barriers. The Kṣatriya of the times was a highly cultured class, and considerably contribnted to and developed philosophical speculation of India. The *Vaiśya* gradually sank in position, while the Śūdra was rising and approximated to the status of Vaiśya (pp. 97–103). Marriage restrictions became stricter as regards exogamy though inter-caste marriages were permitted. It is during this period that we first come across the ideas of ceremonial purity and impurity attaching to certain persons or groups on grounds of initiation or uninitiation for sacrificial purposes.

During the Sūtra period (*c.* B. C. 800–300), still further distinction came to be established between the four classes in regard to occupations, and in several other practices. In addition, birth came to be regarded as fixing up one's caste in spite of any occupation he may take up (pp. 134–148). The difference between Viśyas and Śūdras was becoming thinner (pp. 173 ff.). The rules of purity and impurity, and defilement by touch became more elaborate and rigid; and yet, food cooked by the Śūdra was not unacceptable by higher *varṇa* provided he was sufficiently clean (pp. 180–5).

Ghurye's *Caste and Race in India*[11] proposes to give his views on the history and origin of the caste system as it was and is today among the Hindus (Preface, p. vii). According to this author, the outstanding features of Hindu Society when it was ruled by " the social philosophy of caste, unaffected by modern ideas of rights and duties " are as follows:—(1) ' segmental division,' in the sense, not only of a distinct ' status group ' within a larger community, but also demanding allegiance and obedience to its specific commands even as against those of the judiciary of the State, thus narrowing the community feeling to caste-feeling. This also led to distinct culture patterns between the different castes in several customs. Castes are " small and complete social worlds in themselves, marked off definitely from one another, though subsisting within the society " (p. 6). (2) Hierarchy. (3) Restrictions on feeling and social intercourse. (4) Civil and religious privileges of the different groups. (5) Lack of choice of occupation. (6) Restrictions on marriage. The sources of the evidence to support such findings,[12] which are used by the author indicate that these characteristics were applicable to the caste as it functioned during the last few centuries only.

So far about the *segregative* forces which worked through the caste upon the society. But on the other hand, it is not without certain *cohesive and co-operative* forces too, which held society together: This aspect was particularly manifest in the village organisation. Here, there used to be a number of officials and

11. By G. S. Ghurye. pp. viii + 209. Kegan Paul, London, 1932.

12. The various Census Reparts, and the works of Baines, Bhattacharya, Borradaile, Briggs, Campbell, Crooke, Forbes, Hamilton, Kerr, Martin. Wilson, Sherring, Thurstone, etc.

menials, belonging to different castes, but irrespective of it, having equal voice, not only in civic and social but also in legal matters. The village council, which included members from all castes including the untouchables, would try even a Brahmin. "Interdependence of caste was such a deeply rooted principle that it prevented other exclusive aspects from getting the better of the idea of a common civic goal and human sympathy......and hardening into caste-spirit or caste-patriotism" (p. 25).

The sub-castes also shared these same characteristics, and therefore they were practically as good—or as bad! — as castes. A large number of caste and sub-saste names have professional, tribal or ethnic, territorial or sectarian significance. Even particular diet, or the way of inheritance, might give name to a caste.

Next comes a descriptoin of caste through the ages (chs. iii and iv) divided into four periods,—the Vedic (upto 600 B. C.), post-Vedic (upto the beginning of the Christian era), then upto the 8th century A. D., and then upto the middle of the 19th century. In the Vedic period, the author infers, the Brahmin was definitely regarded as superior to the Kshatriya. The story of Satyakāma Jābāla[13] leads the author to infer, rightly, that lineage was subordinated to the moral characteristic of truth-speaking. Though the four classes were "very nearly exclusive units, upward or downward march was not altogether an impossibility, though it must have been an infrequent occurrance" (p. 48).

In the post-Vedic period also the Brāhmaṇa's status was pre-eminent, and he had many social privileges. The Śūdra was slowly degenerated into a contemptuous group, and "had no civil or religious rights" (p. 58). Since such a social classification was bound to create unrest amongst the oppressed groups, "a philosophy of caste, guaranteeing individual salvation to all, through performance of duties alone, had to be formulated......to allay the unrest and quell the rebellion against caste" (p. 60). And the *Gītā* theory of four classes on the basis of inherent qualities and capacities of individuals, the author asserts, "tries to provide a rational sanction for the manifestly arbitrary divisions " (p. 61).

13. He was asked, before being admitted as a student by his teacher, about his lineage. He pleaded ignorance; whereupon, the teacher acclaimed him to be Brāhmaṇa, for only a Brāhmaṇa can tell the truth. However, the story seems to suggest, rather, the principle that only the truth-speaking can be called Brāhmaṇas !

This theory is unsound according to the author, evidently, for the reason that "it fails to explain how the individuals at the very beginning of creation came to be possessed of peculiar qualities and capacities" (*ibid.*). But, who could ever explain that !

Still more stratification and internal solidarity divided the four *varṇas* later on, by evolving out special privileges, disciplines, disabilities, for each different class, and by development of ideas of pollution or defilement in company, or by touch of a lower caste. During the fourth period, the *Vaiśya* gradually ceased to be reckoned as a separate group superior to *Śūdra* (p. 92). The next discussion of caste in its ethnic bearing (ch. V, pp. 100–123) is outside the scope of our present survey.

Regarding the elements of caste outside India, the author concludes that almost every major civilization in ancient times had them, excepting the Chinese civilization before it was influenced by Indian ideas (Ch. vi). In India, the Brahmanic ideas of ceremonial purity are responsible, mainly, for creating a special and unique distinction, viz. between the 'touchables' and the 'untouchables.' This, added to other factors, like the desire to preserve purity of blood, restrictions on food, consciousness of superiority and group prestige, differentiation in occupations, special rights for the higher classes and disabilities on the lower ones, have caused the rigid castes.

And in recent years, proceeds the author, the British Government also has been responsible for aggravating the caste-spirit—by officially recognizing such classes as 'Brahmins' and 'non-Brahmins,' through the carefully compiled census Reports and Diaries, "by means of nice grading of contemporary groups" (pp. 158, 160 and 162). The author quotes a census officer,[13a] who declares that the British Government "pigeon-holed everyone by caste, and if we could not find a true caste for them, labelled them with the name of an hereditary occupation......Government's passion for labels and pigeon-holes has led to a crystallization of caste-system, which, except amongst the aristocratic caste, *was really fluid under indigenous rule* . . ." (p. 160).[14]

There have been different agitations, as a reaction against caste, for irradicating it, as also those for re-establishing it on the basis of

---

13*a*. Mr. Middleton, one of the two Superintendents of census operations of 1921.

14. Italics ours.

its pristine Vedic principles (like the Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj and Arya Samaj). In course of time, social and religious privileges and disabilities of caste, restrictions on occupation, food etc. have slowly disappeared, though one most important restriction regarding marriage within the sub-group still exists on a large scale. Reservation of seats and services cannot solve the problem of caste (pp. 167–68).

Those who propose to reform the present caste stratification are grouped into three classes by the author : (1) Those, like Mahātmā Gandhi, who want to re-establish the old fourfold classification of society according to the strict original *Dharmaśāstra* principles. (2) Those who would amalgamate sub-castes which have cultural and economic similarities into one caste, and then such of these castes which are approximately on a footing of equality to be further consolidated, till by this process society bocomes casteless. (3) Those who would forthwith abolish all castes. As to the first, Gandhi seems,—according to the author,–"to lay great stress on birth and heredity, and subscribes to the view 'once born a Brahmin always a Brahmin' and would arrange the caste on the basis of birth (p. 183). But on this view the problem of finding out the proper caste for untouchables and also as to what caste should be classified under what *varṇa* would be insoluble difficulties. To adopt the second method is to miss the real problem, for the new organization thus formed takes a more militant attitude against the higher and lower caste and "Caste consciousness becomes more definite and virile" (p. 184).

Hence the true remedy according to the author is "to fight caste all round with a bold front without making any compromise ... caste patriotism must be killed...by ignoring it altogether—by individual, society, the state, privately, officially, publicly. Serious and earnest propaganda against it must be made by leaders. Fusion of blood by inter-caste marriages is another effective method of cementing alliances". "Co-education at all stages of instruction" is a method of bringing together young people of opposite sex with a view to breaking away the ties of caste in marriage. And, finally, priesthood must be entrusted only to the learned and the well instructed irrespective of the (present !) caste so as "to take the edge off the non-Brahmin clamour against the Brahmin priest" (p. 187). We may add, that in this last suggestion, according to us, lie mainly the germs of the real solution, provided the principle underlying it is extended to *any* and *all* classes. Like the priesthood, right sorts

of persons should be entrusted with the task of ruling or political power, of commercial intercourse and enterprise, and of other social services! But, then, what is the *varṇa* principle, in its fundamentals, if not this?

We now come to a most scholarly contribution to Indian Sociology during recent ages, viz, Bhagwan Das's *The Science of Social Organization*, or *The Laws of Manu* [15]. This work, though very scholarly, has taken in too much, resulting occasionally in lack of clarity of expression and co-ordination. Like Plato, this author too feels convinced that only the Philosopher-King can rule human life and affairs properly. Indeed, not only Kings, but every man ought to study carefully, says he, the 'Science of Self', *Adhyātma-Vidyā*, to which all other sciences owe allegiance, and upon which they are dependent. To-day, however, the situation is lamentably different

"Sovereign and subject, statesman and private man, scientist and priest...all having, as a rule. no knowledge and no thought of the 'why' of life, and but a very partial one of the 'how',...condemning as beyond practical politics, all attempts to formulate and teach and reach high ideals in the administration of affairs, even when acknowledging with the lips that...there is a philosophy behind every public movement, that ideas are the forces which move nations,—how shall such guide the human race to happiness?" (p. 15).

Manu and the old sages (*ṛṣis*) of India, however, were not so short-sighted as to try to slove human problems from the so-called 'practical' point of view, which only considered the immediate present, the Path of Pursuit; they devoted deeper attention to the inward workings of minds, to the ultimate ends of human life, to the Path of Renunciation. The two paths are only two halves which make a complete life,—the one describes the 'evolution' of man, the other the 'involution' of man. The object of the Pursuit-half of life is the threefold self-expression through a material body—*Dharma* (Duty), *Artha* (Profit) and *Kāma* (Pleasure). After having exhausted these three objects in due proportions, the self enters the second half of life, whose object is *Mokṣa*, i. e. "self-

15. By Babu Bhagwan Das. 2 Vols. pp. 682. 2nd. Ed., considerably revised and enlarged. (First Ed. 1910). Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras. 1932-35.

expression and self-realization of Itself in all the world-process as Its Play."

However, none may hope to reach to the second stage without having trained himself through the first, gradually and thoroughly, by satisfying the several debts (*ṛṇas*), — which he owes for what he is and has. On the Lower Path, Duty (*Dharma*) leads to Profit (*Artha*) and that to Pleasure (*Kāma*) ; on the Higher Path, similarly, the Love Universal (*Bhakti*) leads to power (*Yogaiśvarya* or *Śakti*) to see the great vision of the Unity of all life, and that in turn to Liberation (*Mukti*). So, the series of *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma* on the lower path corresponds to *Bhakti Śakti* and *Mukti* (or, would not the order rather be : *Mukti*, *Śakti* and *Bhakti* ? -) on the higher path, and both these trios correspond to *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas* (pp. 67-78). [The correspondendence in the two series, as well as the meaning of the thought embodied in this context, is far from quite clear !] The two Paths are thus interdependent, and the way to realize the aims of life in and through these is by planning out and organizing conduct — in the individual as well as in the social aspects, — into the four stages of *āśramas* and the four vocational classes of *varṇas*.

Dharma is not, as it is often taken to mean, a fixed, rigid, static scheme of laws of behaviour. It is relative and variable according to the exigencies of time, place, age, circumstances, sex, temperament, and means available. The neglect or deliberate ignoring of this most fundamental aspect of all law "is the main cause and also the effect...of the disappearance of all living legislation in India... of the replacement of the spirit by the letter...of the healthful, gradual and normal change, which means life, by the rigid and forceful monotony which means ossification, disease and death" (ch. ii). There are interesting analogies drawn in this chapter—though not all of them may be equally convincing to everyone—between certain ideas of the *Smṛtis*, the Epics, and the *Purāṇas* and those of modern evolutionists, psychology, pathology, economics etc.

The main problems of human life are grouped into :

(i) Economical ; (ii) Domestic—sex-problems, family life, population, etc., (iii) Health, physical culture, sanitation etc.; (iv) Education; (v) Administrative-Political—who should rule, the form of government, relations between the executive, legislative, the judicial, the civil, the military, the police, and other depts.; (vi) claims of individualism, nationalism, socialism, and humanism.

All these are but new names for the same perpetual problems for which Manu has given solutions, and these "may be found ultimately satisfactory" (p. 445). His scheme of solutions is the *varṇa-āśrama-dharma*, the four classes and their corresponding debts, duties, rights,. ambitions, rewards, means of living—all arranged under the two Paths and their six ends; and this covers not only all the problems mentioned above, but even more, besides (pp. 149 ff.).

In the Hindu's thought, there is no distinction between the 'secular' and the 'religious'. '*Vid*' (which is the root term of 'Veda') means 'to know' as well as 'to exist',—thus implying that kdowledge and existence are but two aspects of each other. It is in this sense that the Veda is said to be the basis or source (*Mūla*) of all *Dharma*. There is no distinct term for the Hindu 'religion' as there is for other ones. The modern meaning of 'religion', however, is too narrow. Therefore, foreigners wonder that the Hindu eats, drinks, sleeps, bathes, travels, purchases, as well as marries, worships and dies—all by the rules of 'religion' ! On the other hand, he does not wonder, but takes it as a compliment to his 'modern' intelligence, in doing all these things in accordance with the rules of science ! ! And yet, what 'religion' means in the one case, 'science' means in the other ! ! !

Manu's *Varṇa-dharma* and *āśrama-dharma* are indeed descriptions of 'social polity' and 'individual polity' under which he gathers the whole science of life, and which are to be guided by the four *puruṣārthas* of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*. *Varṇa-dharma* is the organization of social life of the whole Human Race, with reference to the fitness and capacity of every individual to contribute to social harmony and welfare. *Āśrama-dharma* is the organization, ordering and planning out of each individual's life so as to bring out the best that is in him. Indeed, Manu's Code of Life is not merely the *Science* of Life, but also the *Art* of Life (p. 206).

The next chapter (ch. iii) of the First Volume of *The Science*, and the whole of Second Volume, discuss the various problems of education and their solutions on the basis of Manu's thought. *The Science* is not yet completed, and the author hopes to bring out a Third Volume dealing with the other three main sub-divisions of social organization, viz, the Domestic and the Economic, the Political, and the Industrial and Labour organizations. The task is stupendous, and, when completed, is bound to be a *magnum opus*. Judg-

ing from the already fulfilled part of his ambition, we could safely rely on the extensive erudition of the author, and hope and pray that he may be given the strength and long life—he is now over 73,—as he has the will, so that he may fulfil the task, and we may learn more fully of the right Code of Life as given by Manu.

Motwani's *Manu : A Study in Hindu Social Theory*[16] presents Manu's Social Theory in terms of modern sociology—which, by the way, "is an American science" for the author. He rightly points out that the Hindus had carried on intense research in almost every branch of knowledge, including sociology, in which alone there are over twenty treatises, and *Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra*—literally, " A Treatise (*Śāstra*) of Social Relations (*Dharma*) among Beings Endowed with Power of Reasoning (*Mānava*)—is only one of them.

After briefly discussing the chronology of Manu's Code (ch. ii), he examines the Vedic background of Manu's thought (ch. iii). According to the Vedas, man is a self, a soul, with many instruments or vehicles for self expression. The biological organism is only one such instrument. Life and matter, therefore, are distinct and yet closely allied. Life is involved in form, in matter, but slowly organizes itself, as also that matter, into finer and finer vehicles in an ever ascending series—through the mineral, the plant, the animal, and the human worlds.

However, there must be a stage where this dualism of life and matter could not exist, where there is Oneness beyond these, where the first cause of this separation lies—that is *Brahma.* He is *nirguṇa* i. e. cannot be described by qualifications or words. But in order that this One may manifest itself into the Many, He takes a formal aspect, which is the qualified one, viz. the *saguṇa Brahma.* It is existence, consciousness and bliss (*sat-chit-ānanda*). Correspondingly, there are three aspects of cosmic matter—*sattva, rajas* and *tamas*, which, in English (as translated by Ernest Wood) are ' natural law ' or ' order,' ' energy,' and ' materiality.' The corresponding aspects in the conscious self are activity (*kriyā*), thought (*jnāna*) and desire (*ichchhā*).

Now, man is continuously evolving and gradually training himself and gathering experience through various ' vehicles ' into

16. By Keval Motwani : pp. 18 + 261. Ganesh & Co. Madras, 1904.

better and better self. Thus, there are two first divisions of mankind: Those who have had enough of training and experience—for them the straight and immediate Path of *nivritti* from whence there is no return is available; those who need experience and training—their Path is that of *pravritti*, through which they have to pass with the aim of attaining the highest perfection of personality. *Yoga* is the method which helps to attaining it quicker.

All these views are accepted by Manu as the basis of his social theory. Corresponding to the three modes of self-expression,—thought, action and desire,—there are three types of personalities in each of which one of these is predominant,—though it has also the other two,—viz, Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya and Vaiśya. The fourth group, the Sūdra, is psychologically an undefined type of personality, one whose predominant note of life cannot be ascertained, because he himself is not clear as to what he is or wants. He has to patiently abide his time, meekly obeying and serving others, till he attains the higher stage.

In conformity with their psychic nature, the functions and occupations for these groups are assigned by Manu. *Dharma*, in this connection, implies that principle which is inherent in the individual or in the object,—we know these by their *dharma*. *Dharma* also describes the three 'social forces' together—pleasure (*kāma*), power (*artha*), and knowledge (*dharma*) (p. 63). The real personality emerges out of a coordination of these three after due and appropriate satisfaction of each of them. But, at the back of all these small desires, there is a fourth social force—the desire for final realization of the One life (*mokṣa*). Corresponding to these four social forces, there are four social institutions (*āśramas*) which crystallize these forces. Each *āśrama* is a preparation for the next, with the aim of progressive perfection of the self, and through him, of the social order. The schematic arrangement of Manu's social theory is as follows:—

I. The Educational Institution—the student (the *brahmachārī's āśrama*)—the non-Aryan group (*śūdra*) who is a child ('once-born').

II. The Economic Institution—Marriage and family (*griha-stha's āśrama*)—the economic group (*vaiśya*).

III. The Political Institution—the partially retired man (*vānaprastha*)—the political group and the state (*kshatriya*).

IV. The Religious institution—the forest-dweller (*sannyāsin's āśrama*)—the teaching group (*Brāhmaṇa*).

The last group, the Brāhmaṇa, however, appears in each of the first three—in I, as the teacher, in II, as the priest, in III, as the judge, the legislature, the councillor or the minister.

I. The Hindu theory of education is complete in the sense that it deals with all the phases of the individual's life—intellectual training, spiritual education, control of action, and submission of desires, — through the very detailed rules of *āchāras* and *vratas*. Through these rules, it reconciles the claims of the individual and the group by assimilating him into group culture. The social group (*varṇa*) corresponding to the student's *āśrama* psychologically is the child; ethnically, it is the *śūdra* or non-Aryan. Both have to be trained into Aryan culture. The *śūdra* is psycho-physically not yet fit to undertake any higher responsibility, but has to work out his way through social service. Hence, Manu's social theory does not imply any rigid compartmentalization into exclusive social groups, but permits free and vertical circulation of individuals. And, the instrumentalities for such mobility or circulation are qualitative, psychological and moral and not quantitative, biological and economic.

II. Marriage and family (*gārhasthya*) are understood by Manu in their biological, ethical as well as educational aspects. The corresponding social group (*varṇa*) is the *vaiśya*, which, by means of economic intercourse, satisfies the desire element (*kāma*) of the society. But it is not without its own ethical code,—which is a very strong point in Manu, for he lays down elaborate rules of kindness, charity, honesty, contentment and just ambitions for this class.

III. The third stage of the individual is *vānaprastha*, that of action and of service in a semi-retired life from the home. The motive behind action in the preceding stage was ' desire '; now it is ' service ' (—is this *artha* ?—). The social group (*varṇa*) corresponding to this is Kshatriya, a member of the political institution.

IV. The last stage of individual's life is of complete retirement by giving up desire and service. The group corresponding to this is Brāhmaṇa. Manu's aim is the social progress of man through all these institutions as social agencies, one after the other.

Such compartmentalization of the various elemental factors of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa* and their juxtaposition into the

four social groups and institutions is likely to convey an impression that they operate separately or independently upon human life in his progress through the four institutions. For instance, to say, as is done above, that the motive behind the *grihastha's* institution and Vaiśya's group is *kāma*, and that behind the *saṁnyāsī's* institution and Brahmaṇā's group is *mokṣa*, naturally leads us to infer, that the motive behind *brahmachārī's* institution and Śūdra's group is *dharma* while that behind *vānaprastha's* institution and Kshatriya's group is *artha*. But such a separation of the operative elemental factors of life would be obviously incorrect and also confusing.

Mees's *Dharma and Society*[17] is a very significant contribution, coming as it does from a European sociologist with all the sincerity of conviction that the Hindu sages have long ago made a great contribution to the social science which, as a ' science, ' is receiving close attention only recently in the West. The study of ancient Hindu social thought will be useful, says the author, for, "They are still of so much bearing on actual problems. . . . . and we could benefit much from them in pointing the way to new developments. " The East and the West are meeting to-day in a variety of ways. But " The Easterners must not turn into cheap copies of Westerners, nor *vice versa*. " They " will do well to remain what they are, that is, keep, as faithfully as possible in accordance with their inner life, to the ways and forms of expression as handed down to them from former generations. " No doubt they have to learn much from each other. But, " the trouble is that the East is taking over the wrong things ! " (Preface, pp. xi, xii).

The book studies the nature of *Dharma* as the fundamental motive force in the life of man as a social being, in relation to the theory of *varṇas*. The great point, the author proceeds to quote Prof. Kern, " is to distinguish between the *Natural* classes (i.e. *varṇas*), and castes, which cannot have arisen naturally, but are *Artificial*"[18] (p. xiv). In the author's view, India will benefit greatly by realising once more the *varṇas* which are the ' natural ' or ' cultural ' classes and the West too had better do the same (p. XV).

---

17. By G. H. Mees. pp. xvi + 206. Pub. N. V. Servire, — The Hague, Holland ; and Luzac and Co., London, 1935.

18. Italics ours.

A whole chapter, at the opening, is devoted to a clarification of the meaning of *Dharma* (ch. I) : Sometimes it has been personified; but its meaning as an impersonal principle is very vast. Bhagwan Das's definition of *Dharma* is quoted as the most enlightening, viz., that it is sometimes understood as "that which holds a thing...also, ...in ethical sense, without implying any 'law' or 'necessity' as in the case of the many virtues like 'truthfulness'; also "as virtuous acts (*Puṇya*), or as religious duty or as the ideal exemplified in the conduct of sages, or as the Universal or Absolute Principle, or as the Divine Justice apportioning the fruits of *Karmas* and maintaining equilibrium, or as a compromise between the ideal and actual conditions, or as convention, or as Law (—not the static but dynamic legal principle, adaptable to changes of conditions)" (p. 11). It was also taken to mean an intertribal or international law.

Again, there is the psychological and sociological distinction between *swadharma* (*dharma* of the individual), *varṇa-dharma* (*dh.* of a natural class), *jāti-dh.* (*dh.* of caste), *Hindu-dh.* or *Ārya-dh.* (as against *Anārya-dh.*) etc. There is a further philosophical and psychological distinction between *pravritti dh.* ('involutionary *dh.*') and *nivritti dh.* ('evolutionary dh.'). *Dharma* is not merely *Karma* in the sense of the tendency due to past and present work, but is also the divine tendency, hidden in the inmost of man's being, to unfold in the future, and holds the principle of freedom. It also implies *bhakti* (love), in the sense of love to neighbour, to humanity, to God, without which *dharma* will be a mere labour. *Nīti* is complementary of *dharma*. *Dharma* then "is the underlying motive principle in the social evolution of humanity towards the manifestation and demonstration of the soul, or in other words, of the basic oneness of mankind..." and is apprehended by men "according to the different stages of their development" (p. 22).

The author places the four *varṇas*, the four *purushārthas* and the four *āśramas* schematically in this way :—

(1) *Śūdra—Artha* (?)*—Brahmachāri's āśrama*
(2) *Vaiśya—Kāma* (?)*—Grihastha*
(3) *Kshatriya—Dharma—Vānaprastha*
(4) *Brāhmaṇa—Mokṣa—Saṁnyāsa*

This, according to the author, shows that there is analogus four-fold division of grades in the life of mankind as a whole, in the individual's life, and in the ends of life respectively. However, to the

present writer at least, such compartmentalization appears not only superficial, but even incorrect, as is indicated above by our interrogative marks into brackets ! [19]

The author rightly points out that *varṇa* is the ideal and theoretical picture of class based on *dharma*; and that 'caste' represents the historical and social conditions not only in India but also elsewhere (p. 51). The famous *Purusha-Sūkta* hymn regarding the origin of *varṇas* from *Purusha's* limbs considers society as a 'physicopsychic organism'—to use Giddings' expression [20]—"a psychical organism essentially, but with a physical basis". It is an organization as well, not merely an organism. *Varṇa* was no doubt based on 'work', but not in the sense of occupation but in the sense of 'a social service resulting from individual inner development." It was certainly not based on birth, for 'birth is difficult to be discriminated until action is shown' (-Mbh. Vana. 180. 21 ff.). Part I of the book is concluded with the following quotation from M. A. Venkata Rao [21], as summing up the Hindu social theory :

" The physical basis of life referred to by *artha* and *kāma* is to be sublimated in accordance with the principles of *dharma*. And *dharma* or social righteousness includes two aspects : *āśrama* or the duties flowing from the stages of life—youth, manhood, old age ; and *varṇa* or the duties flowing from one's position in society as determined by *karma* and *guṇa* (character). *Dharma* is the principle of synthesis linking the individual and society, time and eternity, for it is the bridge that leads to *mokṣa* or absolute freedom of self-realization. The principle of *dharma* envisages the whole process of the education of the spirit from the ' minimum ' morality of bodily control to realization of the *ātman* or *sarvātma-bhāva* (all-self-ness), mediated in the central phase by social contribution." (p. 73).

Part II discusses *varṇa* theory in its manifold relations. Though it supplied mainly an ideal form for the Hindu Society, yet it has the universality of application, and was also upheld as an " international ideal." Parallels to such fourfold groups are found in Iranian thought, in Abul Fazal's work *Ain-i-Akbari*, in Plato, and in the modern social theory of Adam Müller. It is such international element in it that has enabled the Hindu,—as N. K. Dutt and S. V. Ketkar have pointed out,—to keep " a firm hold upon the

19. Cf. the remarks on p. 357.

20. F. H. Giddings: *Principles of Sociology*, p. 420.

21. In *The Aryan Path*, Vol. IV. p. 789.

heterogeneous elements of Indian Population and its wonderful power of absorbing alien races and cultures." Indeed, the Hindu admitted foreigners even into *Brāhmaṇa* class provided they lived according to its rules. It is in this way that too many foreigners—the Chinese, the Ionians or Greeks (*Yavanas*), Scythians (*Śakas*), Tibetans, Burmese, Mongolians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Arabs, Jews, Romans, Abyssinians (e. g. in Janjira) and Persians were gradually entirely absorbed by the Hindus (pp. 79-85).

'Caste' is opposed to such universal implication and is limited by racial or provincial implication. In this sense, unhappily, castes exist not only in India, but also all over the world.

Thus, *dharma* has two aspects with reference to social classification: the first is the ethical, ideal aspect expressing itself in *varṇa* conception; the second is the economic, political, racial, professional aspect expressing itself in caste. When the second aspect began to predominate in man's mind and social life, the first aspect receded to the background, to the social unconscious, till a reaction set in upraising the tendency of the first aspect. This reaction, in India, says the author, has been represented by Mahātmā Gandhi today. There have been many other social evils also, introduced in Hindu society, during the period when the second aspect of *dharma* became predominant, e. g. *Suttee*, sinking of the woman's status, *Pardāh* system, untouchability, etc.

The *varṇa* theory lays emphasis on social duties and not on rights. When it refers to a hierarchy of classes, the principle of '*noblesse oblige*' — responsibilities attendant upon privileges—is operative in it. The higher status is not identified with higher power, pleasure or fame. The theory as referring to *natural* classes involves the principle of ' openness ', as against the castes which are *artificial* and involve a ' fenced-in-state ' (pp. 136-41). " Hierarchy is not coercion " – the author quotes,[22] "—it is the law of the world structures. It is not a threat—but the call of the heart . . . . directing towards the General Good. " Insight into the real nature of ' hierarchy ' or the sense of *varṇa* has to be won again, — " only then can the socializing forces of man be liberated more profusely and the internal harmony of society improved " (pp. 150-52). The word ' hierarchy ' has became unpopular because the *actual* social hierarchy in most societies does not correspond to the *natural*

---

22. From *Hierarchy, 1931,* (*Signs of Agni-Yoga*), p. 5.

hierarchy; if it did, then every individual would fall into his proper place (*ibid.*).

The *varṇa* theory does imply social inequality, but in the sense that men are born with different capacities; but it does not imply spiritual or fundamental inequality. It thus implies a 'vertical' view but not a 'horizontal' division of society. The reference to 'mixture of *varṇas*' means the confusion resulting out of non-correspondence between one's natural or innate tendencies and the activities which he may be compelled to do owing to the social or political or other circumstances. Though the theory stresses the intrinsic worth of the individual yet it is not an 'individualistic' theory, for it is based on the determination of social benefit (pp. 153–172). The 'class' honour as expressed through *varṇa* does not depend upon economic status or political power but upon intellectual insight; it is therefore, that a Brāhmaṇa who lacks both riches and power, but possesses intellectual insight, is more honoured than Kshatriya who possesses power or Vaiśya who possesses riches. However, from the social point of view,—which is the *varṇa* point of view, of course,—any kind of work is equally important, whether it is the sweeper's, the merchant's, the soldier's or of the research student.

The same author's "*The Human Family and India: The Re-shaping of Social Order*"[23] covers, in brief compass, the same ground as is covered in greater details in the preceding book. There is also an attempt at a general application of the best principles of Hindu social thought to some of the present day world problems.

Thoothi's *The Vaishṇavas of Gujrat: A Study in Methods of Investigation of Social Phenomena*[24] is primarily an attempt at "applying and testing the Geddesian theory and methods of the investigation and interpretation of social phenomena" (Preface, pp. x—xi). It is a study of a specific region, in order to find out how far man's life and his habitat mutually affect each other, and how far both of these are affected by native culture as well as the strange culture which comes in contact with it. With this aim in view, the author examines the peculiarities of Gujarat, its religious organization, social organization, economic organization, and finally, the literary and artistic reactions of the Vaishṇava community,—for,

23. By G. H. Mees. pp. xvi + 171. Pub. D. B. Taraporewalla Sons & Co., Bombay 1938.

24. By N. A. Thoothi. pp. xvi + 489. Longmans, London and Bombay, 1935.

"Art is not only a vital part of *Dharma*, but springs of necessity from it, nourishes and is nourished by it" (Preface, p. ix). The whole book is an extremely entertaining study, and is perhaps the first attempt at studying sociologically a community of India from all the so many inter-related and vitally interdependent points of view. The present writer is not competent to judge fully the value of the work so far as it specially investigates the problem of the Vaishnavaite's life and practices ; but, the early sections of the book which relate to the general religious and social organizations, so far as these are based on the *Dharma-Śāstras*, are relevant for our purposes, and the findings therein apply generally to the whole of Hindu social organization. I shall state these, as far as possible, in the author's own words.

According to the author, the Vedas depict human life as an attempt to understand and determine the place of the forces of nature with a view to the management and direction of human affairs, and hence, human life is conceived therein as life of action.

As nature reveals its powers and attitudes (in terms of change, order and development), man comes to realize their importance in his life, and declares the glory of their strength and resourcefulness in prayers, and praise. If we analyze these (Vedic) prayers and rituals, they give us composite outlines of the science and philosophy of nature, of man, and of the ultimate, as the seers of the Vedas taught and practised (p. 31).

"During the Vedic times, man found himself surrounded with the myriad ways in which nature displays itself. He found out that nature was like a double-edged sword : on the one hand it revealed a kingdom of order and benignity ; and it was a reign of storm and desrtuction on the other. He vaguely saw in nature certain unbending, inalienable and necessary elements that ruled the events and course of his life. Realizing that he had to deal with such powerful forces, he chose the line of least resistance in adjusting his relations with them ; in praising their boons and in propitiating their wrath he found out the way to victory in the course of action in his life. So, along lines of co-operation he tried to define the rôle of each of these in the active life of man. Pleasing them, praising them, behaving according to what he considered were their laws and their order, asking for their blessings, offering them the very best he possessed, man found out the way of stabilizing human existence.

"So he felt called upon to deify the several forms of nature in his prayers and hymns of praise. These deities came to be worshipped at *Yajñas* wherein, along with the repetition of prayers and the singing of hymns, man offered the best he possessed (e. g., milk, butter, corn, fruits, cattle and other good things of life) as dedication to the gods whose laws he yearned to understand and obey, whose blessings he sought, whose mercy he prayed for, and whom he thanked for the boons they were bestowing upon him. These offerings of the very best of his possessions, and his prayers of supplication and thanksgiving, are indicative of a spirit of action modified by a prayerful self-surrender, and consequent reliance on the good will of the gods to worship whom he undertook to perform the *Yajña*. Therefore all work, all the affairs of human life—personal, social, occupational, economic—began with some dedicatory rites which invoked the aid, good will and the blessings of the gods. In fact the success or failure of any human undertaking depended not upon human will, expectations, or hopes, but upon the will of the gods. *Agni*, the god of fire, was the keeper of the home; *Agni* interpreted to man the will of the gods. And *Agni* carried the prayers of the devoted to the gods. Fire was therefore kept burning day and night in the home, it was worshipped daily; and, for all practical purposes, life at home was ruled by the sanctity and reverence that gathered round the fire-place. In this sense, human life and the things thereof were regarded as dedications to the service of the gods; and the *Yajña*, its rituals and its hymns are symbolic of a life of action—of work and deeds—on the part of man in a spirit of dedication and self-surrender, thus revealing the realization by man of his natural and active rôle for the further unfolding of the divine scheme of the universe. And so, ravages to man's life by nature's violence were usually connected with the wrath of the gods due to man's waywardness, wrong doing and sin, by his not conducting himself according to the will of the gods.

"In this process of deifying the power of nature, and wisely adjusting the tenor of his life in their midst, uniformities and other secrets of nature were revealed to man in terms of *Rita*, *Vritta* and *Dharma*, the very essence and embodiment of whose nature was declared as manifest in the *Brahman*, 'the one and only truth which the wise describe in many ways.'" (pp. 31-33).

This natural and simple life of action and devotion round *Yajñas* developed into a more speculative attitude which sought to examine the inner nature of things, leading, gradually, towards a

more and more rational and systematic understanding and intepretation of natural phenomena, of life and of the conduct of life,—through the *Saṁhitās*, the *Āraṇyakas*, the *Upaniṣads*, etc. In this manner, came the six *Vedāṅgas*, viz. the sciences of phonetics, meter, grammar, etymology, religious rites and duties (*Kalpa*) and and their proper seasons (*Jyotiṣa* and the four *Upavedas* viz. the sciences of medicine (*Āyur-Veda*), of military training (*Dhanur-veda*), of music (*Gāndharva-Veda*) and of mechanics (*Sthāpatya-Veda*). Of these, the *Kalpa* sciences further developed into *Śrauta-sūtras* which concern themselves with the various functions connected with *yajñas* of a public nature, the *Grihya-sūtras* which prescribe the personal and domestic life of householders, and the *Dharma-sūtras* which describe and regulate the life and conduct of man as a member of a community.

Besides thus manifesting itself in these two aspects of a life of activity (*karma*) and of speculation (*jñāna*), the Vedic tradition also revealed itself in a third aspect, viz. of devotion to the divine (*bhakti*), and prayer and attitude of self-surrender to him. *Yajña* itself originated from and also later developed and rationalized into such an attitude of self-surrender and self-sacrifice ; and the three aspects of life later developed into the three ' ways ' (*mārgas*) or three kinds of *yajñas* as instrumental to final salvation of man. (Hence the names—*karma-mārga* or *karma-yajña* ; *jñana-mārga* or *jñāna-yajña* ; and *bhakti-mārga* or *bhakti-yajña*).

Dharma has been used to imply many things by the Hindu : *Karma* and *Dharma* are seen as two interdependent forces which guide the destinies of human existence, and settle the meaning of life for man; *Dharma* reveals certain conditions of the inner nature within each one of us in accordance with which the individual is called upon to evolve towards perfection in terms of action and behaviour that mould his relations with the outside world. *Dharma* is thus not concerned with the outside order of things ; it is concerned with the very inmost nature, condition and law of our being (pp. 42-43).

The *Śrauta*—, *Grihya*—, and *Dharma-Sūtras* together restate the laws of *yajña* in terms of different *karmas* and *dharmas*. The *Purushārthas* of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Moksha* are the four elemental factors governing man's existence, in the midst of which he has to adjust the course of his life. And how to manage this is taught by the three groups of the *Sūtras*.

"Hinduism teaches that each one of us is born to achieve *Moksha*, that is salvation. Life is therefore the struggle of *Dharma* in terms of *Artha* and *Kāma* to achieve this end. *Dharma* therefore seeks to cooperate with *Artha* and *Kāma* to achieve the final end of existence viz. *Moksha*.

"Now *Artha* and *Kāma* are born of the very nature of man, abundantly given by the very birth and what it brings in its train of the material, social and bodily heritage. And *Dharma* is also born simultaneously; but in lesser measure, perhaps as natural instinct. It is to be discerned in the cultural heritage of the people as manifest in their personal character, beliefs and their way of life, for they are supposed to use these Dharmas as the motive and guiding power of their life of *Artha* and *Kāma*, helping them to achieve the great end of their existence, that is to say, *Moksha*.

"......Really speaking, these four principles that govern man's life are not so mutually exclusive; they are interdependent factors that work together whether man will it or not; and they should co-operate in order that the individual may be enabled to bring forth the fullness of his powers at any stage of his development, if man only gives to each its due place and expression in his life. If this is done, the equilibrium and harmony of his personal evolution will be secured, and if, along with and in virtue of these, man observes the laws of *Varṇa*, the equilibrium of social life must also follow" (pp. 45–46).

"*Dharma* is that which makes things what they are. Therefore *Dharma* means the nature of things. Thus in India, as in Greece, the attempt is made to turn the natural into the ideal. This works on the assumption that the ideal or normal is deducible from the actual. And it implies that man has a stable nature, and that it is teleological and capable of indicating the course he ought to follow.

"In a larger sense, then, the theory of *Dharma* endeavours to relate everything in the universe in terms of a principle. In the narrower sense, *Dharma* refers to a system of ideal relations of man with the rest of the universe (seen and unseen), and to man's individual and social conduct in life. Thus the search for the harmony of the inner with the outer, and of the outer with the inner of human conduct is the theme of *Dharma*.

"To summarize, then: *Dharma* seeks to give a programme of life for the individual, for the social, religious, and other groups, in

relation to each other, such as would make the best possible manifestation of life probable and even real. Out of the variety in which life may and can express itself, rather than letting man live somehow in any direction that may lead anywhere, *Dharma* sets the direction which the best in out midst, in ages past and now, have taught man to follow, and seek thus the way towards perfection. Thus *Dharma* becomes the instrument for the fulfilment of life in terms of social, religious and economic organization and control. In terms like these *Dharma* records the traditional sanctions of a socio-religious nature, wherein the material and cultural heritage from experience, history, tradition and usage, are gathered into one focus. In yet another sense, *Dharma* may be said to be a search for the solution of the problem of human relations in terms of human freedom, or of the problem of human freedom in terms of social relations with reference to the ideals of life. If *Dharma* concerns itself with the loyalties of personal, social, economic and spiritual relations that bind man to each of them, and to all of them as a related whole, *Dharma* concerns itself with the theory and practice of the right and the just in human affairs.

"We hope these attempts at defining *Dharma* sufficiently justify our attitude that *Dharma* is a search, however elusive, to shape the Natural in terms of the Ideal, and to deduce the Ideal from the Natural. Thus, in infinite series of such adjustments through ages of human endeavour, man hopes to be enabled ultimately to find out the laws of the harmony between the actual and the ideal that may bring forth that prefection of human existence which is prayed for by prophets and sages in terms like, ' Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. ' " (pp. 62–63.).

In his *Annihilation of Caste*,[25] Ambedkar has narrated his " tale of the sad effects which caste has produced " (p. 38). Caste system is not only a division of labour but also an unnatural division of labours into water-tight compartments which is not based on natural aptitudes and choice, leading to a stratification of occupations which is positively pernicious, involves a false hierarchy of status, and subordinates man's natural powers and inclinations to the exigencies of social rules (pp. 20–22). Nor has it served to maintain the purity of the race, for there is no pure race anywhere

25. By B. R. Ambedkar, pp. xi + 82 + 29. 1937. Publisher's name not given.

today. A society to be progressive cannot depend upon such anti-social foundations; it must seek the foundations in liberty, equality and fraternity (p. 38). There are reformers in India who want to return to the old ideal of Chāturvarnya which is not based on birth but on worth (guna). · But then, why insist upon these old lables of Brāhmana, Kshatriya, etc.? These names are associated with certain notions and sentiments, and their continuance is bound to come in the way of unlearning and forgetting the caste system (pp. 41–42).

Besides, Chāturvarnya is impracticable as a system of social organization, is harmful and has turned out to be a miserable failure. "The principle underlying caste" is not only "fundamentally different from the principle underlying *varṇa* but they are also fundamentally opposed" (pp. 42–43). If this is so, then how are we going to reduce the four thousand castes already based on birth into the four *varṇas*? So again, is it possible to classify men just into these four "sharply marked off classes"?—asks this author (pp. 43–44). But, we may interrupt here, the *varṇas* are not supposed to be *sharply* marked off classes but *broad* divisions into which any society may be conveniently classified *without implying any barriers in the way of transition from one class to another.*

A third difficulty, proceeds the author, is that of maintaining the Chāturvarnya system without a penal system against the transgression of its rules. And the fourth difficulty is the classification of women into this system. "Given these difficulties," says the author "I think no one except a congenital idiot could hope and believe in a successful regeneration of the Chāturvarnya" (p. 46)!

Discussing the remedies against the caste-evil, the author says that to abolish the sub-castes might only strengthen and solidify the caste, and these castes may not be further enabled to dissolve themselves into one group. Inter-dining too is not a far-reaching remedy, for already there are many castes who inter-dine without abolishing their caste-feeling. The only real remedy is inter-marriage. But then, why is this remedy not being accepted by the Hindus? Merely because they are deeply religious, because they revere their Śāstras as sacred, and these have inculcated the deep-rooted notions of caste in their minds. Hence, the really effective remedy would be to destroy the belief in the sanctity of the *Śāstras* (pp. 57–59).

However, in Hindudom, realization of such principles of reform is impossible, the author opines. The Hindu is not open to reason, is not free to follow his reason. According to Manu, "there is no place for reason to play its part" in such matters for the Hindu, because, he must follow the three sanctions of *veda, smṛti* and *sadācāra.* (*vedaḥ smṛtiḥ sadācāraḥ svasya ca priyamātmanaḥ*) (p. 67). It is not understandable why the author here omits the mention of the last sanction, viz. *svasya ca priyam ātmanaḥ.* The author further supports his assertion by the following *ślokas*:

योऽवमन्येत ते मूले हेतुशास्त्राश्रयात् द्विजः ।
स साधुभिर्बहिष्कार्यो नास्तिको वेदंनिन्दकः ॥

पुराणं मानवो धर्मः सांगो वेदश्चिकित्सितं ।
आज्ञासिद्धानि चत्वारि न हन्तव्यानि हेतुभिः ॥

श्रुतिद्वैधं तु यत्र स्यात् तत्र धर्मावुभौ स्मृतौ ।
या वेदबाह्याः स्मृतयो याश्च काश्च कुदृष्टयः ।
सर्वास्ताः निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोनिष्ठा हि ताः स्मृताः ॥

वेदार्थत्वोपनिबंधृत्वत् प्रामाण्यं हि मनोः स्मृतं ।
मन्वर्थविपरीता तु या स्मृतिः सा न शस्यते ॥

These *ślokās*, according to him, are enough to prove that a Hindu "is not free to use his reasoning faculty" (pp. 67–68). Though Manu gives *sadācāra* a higher place as a sanction than even the *śāstras*, it does not mean right and good acts, but ancient custom, good or bad. To prove this, the following verse is cited:

यस्मिन् देशे य आचारः पारंपर्यक्रमागतः ।
वर्णानां किल सर्वेषां स सद्राचार उच्यते ॥

Hence, no good reform against caste is possible, proceeds the author, unless the religion of the *śrutis* and the *smṛtis* itself is destroyed (pp. 70–71). We have only to remark here that no dispassionate study of the real merit and value of the *śāstras* could rest itself on such stray citations taken out of their context, without carefully and thoroughly considering the whole of the topic and the whole of the subject matter under discussion of the *śāstras.*

The present writer's book on *Hindu Social Institutions with reference to their Psychological Implications*,[26] is a socio-psychological study, and looks at the Hindu institutions from the ideological and valuational point of view. More than in any other peoples, ideas of the nature of here and hereafter are at the basis of Hindu institutions, and so, they must be understood and evaluated in the light of and in relation to such fundamental conceptions. All the different kinds of *dharmas*, the *āśrama* and the *varṇa* scheme, the various institutions like education, marriage, family, etc. are devised by the Hindu with such fundamental conceptions in view. And these conceptions are concerned with the training of the individual self through successive stages towards the end of self-lessnes, *Mukti*, liberation, or whatever other name may be given to it. *Āśrama*-institutions provide primarily for the *nurture*, the schooling, the psychological development, and the *varṇa* institution provides primarily for the *nature*, the given, the biological characteristics, of man. And it is through such psycho-biological channels and their proper adjustment that the individual is sought to be moulded into a more and more moral (*Dhārmika*) personality and is then able to reach the final aim or achivement or purpose for which all life is meant, and for which it is but an instrument. All the major social institutions are analyzed in the book and attempt is made to show that through all of them and through the numerous and meticulous details of their schemes, such a central theme pervades.

Though my *Two Lectures on Hindu Social Institutions*[27] generally maintains, in outline, the same thesis as above, the approach to the subject is quite different here. The essential features of social institutions in general are first analyzed, and attempt is made to convey-particularly to the enthusiastic social reformer— how it is imperative for him to be extremely cautious, deliberative, and far-sighted in his task, how it is necessary to distinguish between real reform and psudo-reform which is but another name for a cry fôr a ' change, ' and to probe deep into the roots of the origin, development and structure of any institution in order to be able to judge and decide if and what change would mean real reform and what would not.

---

26. By P. Valavalkar. pp. xxii + xvii + 388; Longmans, London and Bombay, 1939.

27. Delivered at the invitation of Baroda Government, in January-February, 1942. Pub. by Baroda Government, 1942.

Apte's *Social and Religious Life in the Grihya Sūtras*[28] gives a picture of the Hindu society between 2500 B. C.—200 B. C., as gathered from the original Sanskrit sources, and arranged systematically under the following topics:— caste-system, marriage and family, political life, dress, customs, superstitions, manners and morals, amusements and entertainments, food and drink, trade and commerce, ancient house-building, flora and fauna, health and sanitation, astronomy and astrology, education, religion, rituals for the dead, and finally, general outlook on life. In addition, each topic is supplemented by a brief review of Vedic times for a ready comparison, and also an appendix of 15 pages on social conditions in Avestan Literature at the end of the book. Each topic is divided into several sub-headings under which the several social practices are grouped. As has been aptly remarked in the *Foreword* to the book by R. D. Karmarkar: "It is only recently that Sociology, as a science for study, has come into its own and projects are being set on foot for sociological surveys of different regions or races. But such surveys seem to have been carried out in India at least 2000 years ago! For, after all, what are the *Grihya Sūtras* of the different *Śākhās* but the sociological surveys of their respective sects?"

All this data must be studied, interpreted and evaluated from the modern sociological point of view, and for such a purpose, the book will serve as a valuable basis or data to the student trained in the sociological method.

Āśramas-Past and Present[29] by P. Chenchiah and others is concerned with the problem of fusion between the ancient Hindu ideals of *Āśrama*-especially the *Vānaprastha-āśrama*-and the true Christian spirit of service and sacrifice. "There is a danger of our making bonfire of the past, good and bad, much to our detriment, "—the authors have rightly protested. They strongly plead for the revival of *Āśramas* "in the interest of national growth and prosperity". The authors seem to confuse, however, the *varṇa* theory with the modern caste groups and therefore are led to condemn *varṇas*. Only one of the authors at one place

---

28. By V. M. Apte. pp. xxxix + 340. Pub. by the Author, Gujarat College, Ahmedabad. 1940.

29. By P. Chenchiah, V. Chakkarai and A. N. Sundarisanam, pp. xvi + 327. Indian Christian Book Club; Kilpauk. No date.

seems to recognize the distinction when he admits that "original caste had not much resemblance to its modern descendant...was not originally a petrified segregation of groups but a functional division of society..." (p. 39). That "*āśrama* affords a natural meeting place, a medium of exchange, for sincere aspirants" amongst the Hindus as well as the Christians, is exemplified by a description of several Christian *Āśramas* in this book.

It is gratifying to note that considerable interest is being shown in Hindu social thought in the West, as is evinced by the works of Urwick and Mees above; at the same time, it is painful to see that some of the veterans there do not yet care to look at the more profound studies on the subject, and betray a lack of sounder information which is now readily available, not only when they occasionally or in passing refer to Indian thought—as in the case of Briffault[30]—but even when they propose to make a special study of it or write on it. Hertzler's *Social Thought of the Ancient Civilizations*[31] and Wiese-Beckers' *Systematic Sociology*[32]–seem to be suffering to some extent from such shortcoming. *Social Thought* refers to none of the works we have discussed in this essay and published before its appearance,—neither in the text nor in the bibliography—excepting that of Motwani–probably because this work was prepared in an American University ! *Systematic Sociology* refers to *Dharma* as a rigid social principle according to which "members of a social system it regulates are not assigned their functions and positions through comparison of their abilities and achievements with those of other members (as in the case of experimental competition), but on the contrary, in which functions and positions are predetermined by an established rule" (p. 258). There is no need to comment on this in view of what

30. Robert Brieffault, in his essay on "Sex in Religion" in *Sex and Civilization* (Ed. by Calverton and Schmalhausen) refers to India as a place "where harvest festival is a signal for a general license..... as a matter of absolute necessity..... men cast aside conventions and women all modesty and complete liberty is given to girls, ..." etc. For more examples, see my *Hindu Social Institutions*, pp. 145–6.

31. By J. O. Hertzler. pp. 409. The Ch. on 'Indian Social Thought' covers 32 pages. Mclyraw-Hill, New York, 1936.

32. Based on *Beziehungslehere* (1924) and *Gebildelehre* (1929), of Leopold von Wiese (of the University of Cologne). Adapted and Amplified by Howard Becker. pp. 772. John Wiley, New York, 1932.

has been said about the flexibility of *Dharma* by several scholars who have made a special study of the concept and its content as noticed above. Bogardus's *The Development of Social Thought*[33] gives a very brief but fair summary of early Indian thought (pp. 37–47).

We have now reached the end of our survey. During the course of our rapid journey through the investigations and findings of different scholars, we have encountered a variety of opinions, some of which are even opposed to each other. I have deliberately limited my own comments and criticisms on these to only brief and suggestive remarks, either allowing each scholar to speak for himself or otherwise trying to represent *his* views as faithfully as I could. I have not tried to pass judgment as to which of these views is acceptable or unacceptable, or more or less so, but have left the reader to judge and decide this for himself. And, I hope, he has sufficient material before him to come to such a decision of comparative values.

Note : I have come across the following titles of books, published during the period under consideration, in the course of my investigations for this survey, but have not been able to find them in any of the libraries in Bombay or Poona, and so could not notice them in the survey :—

Ghose Aurobindo : *The Psychology of Social Development* (no date)

Mavalankar, S. K. : *Castes in India.* 1930.

Narasu, P. L. : *A Study of Caste.* 1922.

Rao, C. Hayavadana: *Indian Caste System: A Study.* 1934.

Devi, Aksaya Kumari : *The Fundamentals of Hindu Sociology.*

Valuable research in Hindu social thought is being carried out in the Sociology Department of the Bombay University. For instance, the research studies like those on *Hindu Kinship* by K. M. Kapadia, or *The Hindu View of War* by M. V. Moorthy, carried out

33. By E. S. Bogardus. pp. 564. Longmans, New York and London, 1940.

in that Department, would have been of interest for us. But, to include these unpublished works in the *Survey* would have been unfair to similar studies which must have been completed in other Universities like Lucknow, Calcutta or Mysore, and so, I had to omit them.

So also, in view of the short time and also space at my disposal, I could not take notice of the literature on the subject which has been published in the various periodicals, and therefore is scattered; nor could I undertake to discuss the indirect contribution to our subject contained in works like P. V. Kane's "*History of Dharma-Śāstras*" for the same reasons.

Bombay, May 1942.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY : A SURVEY
(1917-1942)

By

P. T. Raju

I

The term Indian Philosophy has so long been used in a narrow meaning and covers only the philosophical systems of our ancients. All new attempts at philosophical construction have practically been ignored and their results dubbed as Western philosophy or as fantastic. In consequence Indian philosophy has been denied its natural progress, and there are scholars who find it inconceivable that Indian philosophy can have any further development. The fact is overlooked that every philosophical system, however logical a construction it may be, not only reflects its cultural surroundings and the outlook of the people but is more or less their result. As these change, the philosophy of the people also progresses. It is not absolutely untrue that every civilization has its own logic so that, however objective our logic may appear, ultimately when higher and deeper questions are raised, it will be discovered to belong, in a very important sense, to a particular time and place. Consequently when philosophical progress is admitted, it is incumbent on us to treat every new philosophy that appears in India as forming part of Indian philosophy.

Besides, all our philosophical research becomes aimless when the fact and necessity of this progress is not recognised. If the aim of our research is to know what our ancients said about the world, then our interest is only antiquarian; and what we study will have to be treated as unconnected with our lives. The answer may be that our ancient philosophy had an other-worldly aim and that the nature of the other world remains the same for ever. But then our philosophy would have no interest for those who do not believe in the other world. Further, the assumption would be that philosophy is always other-worldly, which it is not. And the question still remains whether we are to include or not in Indian philosophy the philosophical speculations which may appear in the future.

One peculiar result of this attitude is that every Sanskrit Pandit is here regarded as a philosopher. But we should remember

that every Greek and German scholar is not a philosopher and similarly every Sanskrit scholar is not one. It is true that, Sanskrit being a dead language, a good deal more knowledge of the language is required for the understanding of Sanskrit philosophical texts than of English for the understanding of English philosophy. But this admission does not imply that every Sanskrit scholar without the necessary training in philosophical thinking can be a philosopher. And training is needed not only in Sanskrit philosophy but also in the European. It will not do if one knows a little about Berkeley's *Principles* or Spinoza's Substance. A more systematic training is necessary before India can produce many philosophers who can rank with the greatest intellects of the West. Apart from the question of producing new systems, even in interpreting our ancient thought a good knowledge of Western philosophy is necessary. If we do not forget the function of apperception in understanding and consequently that to understand is to interpret, if we bear in mind that our modern outlook is deeply enough penetrated by Western thought, we will not undervalue the importance of a good discipline in Western thought before the interpretation of Indian thought is attempted.

We can easily see why the modern interpreter of Indian thought is not at all in an enviable position. He is criticised by those not initiated into Western thought as misinterpreting the Indian. In the majority of the cases these critics possess peculiar notions about Western philosophy and their knowledge of the same is derived from half-understood clues and catchwords. Afraid of such criticisms some do not attempt interpretations but expositions which are not far better than translations of important passages from Sanskrit works brought together by means of connecting sentences. But the understanding of such works is as difficult as that of the originals and they do not help the student of philosophy much.

One peculiar line of philosophical interpretation followed by Sanskrit scholars is the use of the historical method. So far as the tracing of the cultural growth and the development of philosophical concepts is concerned, it is a very useful method. But in understanding any philosophy as a system it has definite drawbacks. What is wanted in systematic understanding is the knowledge of the logical interconnections between the concepts used in a system and not the phases of meaning through which the word or concept has passed. When a philosopher uses a concept he does not necessarily use it in its etymological meaning. Commentators on Sanskrit

philosophical texts often discuss the derivations of words ; but there are some terms which are *pāribhāṣika* or technical, the meaning of which is fixed. Even in the case of ordinary words where derivations are discussed each commentator gives his own derivations and they become so many and sometimes so fantastic that it seems safer to take the word in the meaning which fits the system.

This general trend of philosophical activity seems thus to start with the assumption that Indian philosophy means the philosophy produced in India before the 16th century A. D. But if in interpreting this activity it is to be understood as having some deeper purpose, it should be interpreted as leading up to and culminating in the philosophical thought of the contemporary thinkers. Hence no survey of Indian philosophy would be complete unless contemporary thinkers who have trodden somewhat new paths are also included.

Naturally all new speculations outside India cannot be Indian philosophy. There can be only Western scholars of Indian thought, whether ancient or modern.

II

Contemporary work[1] on Indian thought may be roughly classed into five kinds. First, there is the work done by scholars like Sir Ganganatha Jha, Mm. Gopinath Kaviraj and others, who advocate more or less literal translation. Even in this translation they are so scrupulous as to sacrifice, if necessary, idiom and beauty of language to precision in meaning. They have very cogent reasons on their side. For instance a sentence like " Knowledge has the power to reveal ultimate truth " may have nothing ambiguous or intriguing in meaning to a student unacquainted with Indian philosophy. For him it means simply that knowledge reveals ultimate truth. But to a student acquainted with Indian thought the meaning is not so simple. *Śakti*, power or energy, is a distinct category in some of the Indian systems ; and the way the idea is expressed may convey the meaning that *Śakti* or power, which is one entity, resides in knowledge, which is another entity. The problem of the relation between *śakti* and its possessor has been the battle ground of Indian philosophers like the Naiyāyikas and the Mīmāṁsakas, the former maintaining that they are the same and the latter that

1 This section is adopted from the author's *Idealistic Thought of India* (to be published).

they are different. And the writer who unwarily uses the above expression is suspected of having misunderstood Indian thought. Much therefore can be said in favour of the kind of work done by these scholars. They are less in favour of interpretation than translation. But as translation is not unoften interpretation, they try to be so literal that it sometimes becomes difficult to understand without the aid of the original texts.

The second kind of work is that done by Dr. S. N. Dasgupta. He is in favour of simple exposition, but hesitates to draw comparisons between Indian and European philosophers, lest he might misinterpret the former. But in expounding the Indian systems he follows so closely the method of the original text that the ideas in the garb of the English language some times appear strange. Unless one is aquainted with the original texts also one cannot well appreciate the importance of the ideas as expounded by Dr. Dasgupta. Modern students of philosophy often miss their real significance as the systems expounded are not recast in forms that are more familiar. So far as the contention of the previous group of workers is concerned, Dr. Dasgupta's work is not completely inoccuous and invulnerable. For even the slightest freedom in the use of language may lead to ambiguities and misinterpretations. But yet his writings appear familiar to those who are aquainted with the original texts of Indian philosophy and not with the European. They only feel that they are within their own element and at home. But they miss much that is of importance with reference to Western philosophical thought.

Professor Radhakrishnan boldly institutes comparisons between Indian and European philosophers and brings to the forefront the significance of Indian philosophical concepts with reference to the Western. Some of the orthodox readers may feel something alien in his writings; but students of pure philosophy, who are not mere scholars but have undergone training in philosophical thinking, feel more at home in them than in those of Dr. Dasgupta.

The fourth kind of work is that done by some like K. C. Bhattacharya. They do not pretend to expound any Indian system. They reach its results in their way. And they hesitate to reveal their connections with any ancient system. Such work shows originality; it reveals a line of reasoning in the complex structure of thought. Of course it bears marks of the influence of both Eastern and Western thought. But its connections with ancient philosophy

appear meagre. Perhaps the reason for the adoption by these writers of this method is the fear that they might be blamed for misinterpreting Indian philosophy by reading their own thought into it. And so they claim no connection with it except in results.

There are some writers whose acquaintance with European thought is greater than with the Indian. Professor Hiralal Haldar, for instance, is a well-known student of Western Idealism and claims little acquaintance with the Indian. So far as the development out of ancient Indian thought is concerned, such writers may not play a direct part. But their teachings may have an indirect influence by giving to the student a peculiar turn in thinking.

Leaving out thinkers like Dr. Haldar who claims no acquaintance with Indian philosophy and Professor K.C. Bhattacharya who does not claim any connection with it except in results, the difference between the other three groups is one of degree rather than of kind. First, translation, however literal it may be, is the expression of ideas in a different tongue. If we remember that language has a growth and that words carry in their meaning sometimes the different changes in connotation which the ideas have undergone, we see that translation can only be slightly different from interpretation. How far is it safe, for instance, to translate the word *abhāva* by the word negation or sublation? The English word has been used in varying significance; sometimes it means the contradictory, sometimes the contrary, sometimes only the different, and at other times transformation of something into another or of the lower into the higher. Similarly how is the word *jaḍadravya* to be translated? Is it to be translated by the word matter or material substance? Both matter and substance have been used in different connotations. Of late matter is not regarded as substance but as energy that follows certain laws; and some are disposed to think of it even as conscious. The definition of substance as given by Spinoza, for instance, may not be acceptable to the Naiyāyikas. What then is the translator to do? Is not a translation as prone to mislead as an interpretation? Just as a transliterator gives in the beginning of his work the meaning of the diacritical marks he uses, a translator will have to give the exact meanings of the English terms he adopts. For this purpose he has to study English philosophy, know the varied meanings which the philosophical terms possess, and then point out the sense in which the word is used in the system. But how is this kind of work different from interpretation? If a translator is to be unambi-

guous and clear he is to be an interpreter as well. Only, the latter is more systematic and thorough in his interpretation. Comparisons have to be drawn to show the slight shades of difference in meaning. In the development of any system of thought the procedure always takes the form of an examination of the interconnections between ideas; and this task might have been carried to greater lengths in some systems than in others with reference to certain concepts. Hence in some systems the same term may have more connotation than in others. So neither translation nor simple exposition can in truth exclude comparison. It may not be explicitly made, but it must have been tacitly understood. But unless explicitly made the ideas cannot be clear.

III

The most important part of the philosophical research done in the world since 1917 in Indian philosophy is that on Buddhism. The help given to it by the Russian and other European Governments and the Governments of Buddhist nations of Asia has enabled scholars to bring to light vast hidden treasures of Buddhist literature from far off Mongolia to Annam. Some of the names that stand out foremost among scholars of Buddhism are those of la Valle Poussin, Th. Stcherbatsky, Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids, B. C. Law, G. Tucci, D. T. Suzuki, Max Walleser and S. Levi. And the most important series in which Buddhist works have been published are the Pali Text Society, Simon Hemavitarene Bequest Publications, The Sacred Books of the Buddhists and the Bibliotheca Buddhica. Some works are published in the Gaekwad Oriental Series and the Harvard Oriental Series. There are many works not included in these series, a list of some of which is given below.

G. K. Nariman: Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, Bombay, 1920.

P. V. Bapat: The Suttanipāta, Poona, 1920.

B. C. Law: Buddhist Studies, Calcutta, 1931.

D. T. Suzuki: Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture.

la Vallee Poussin: L'Abhidharmakosa de Vasubandhu, Paris, 1923.

B. C. Law: The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa, Calcutta, 1930.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, London, 1923.

Magdalene and Wilhelm Geiger : Pāli Dhamma, München, 1921

K. J. Saunders : Gotama Buddha, Oxford, 1922.

R. Otto Franke : Dhamma Worte, Jena, 1923.

A. Gawrouski : Studies about the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature, Krakowie, 1919.

Karl E. Newmann : Lieder der Monche und Nonnen Gotamo Buddhos, Munchen, 1923.

J. E. Carpenter : Buddhism and Christianity, London, 1923.

Richard Schmidt : Der Eintritt in den Wandel in Erleuchtung (*Bodhicharyāvatāra*), Paderborn, 1923.

Th. Stcherbatsky : The Central Conception of Buddhism, London, 1924.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : Buddhist Psychology, London, 1924.

Fr. Weller : Der Chinesische Dharmasangraha, Leipzig, 1923.

G. Tucci : Saptaçatikaprajñāpāramitā, Roma, 1923.

: Studio Comparitivo fra le tre Versioni Cinesi e il Testo Sanscrite del 1 C 2 Capitolo del Laṅkāvatāra, Roma, 1923.

K. J. Saunders : Buddhism and Buddhist in Southern Asia, New York, 1923.

von H. Beckh : Buddhismus, Berlin, 1923.

B. C. Law : The Buddhist Conception of Spirits, Calcutta, 1923.

B. M. Barua : The Ajivikas, Calcutta, 1920.

: Prolegomena to a History of Buddhist Philosophy, Calcutta, 1918.

K. J. Saunders : Epochs in Buddhist History, Chicago, 1924.

E. W. Burlingame : Buddhist Legends, Cambridge, Mass., 1921.

: Buddhist Parables, New Haven, 1922.

H. Gunter : Buddha in den abendländischen Legenden, Leipzig, 1922.

J. Charpentier : The Uttarādhyayanasūtra, London, 1921.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : Tīkapattāna of the Abhidhammapitaka, London, 1923.

A. B. Keith : Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon, Oxford, 1927.

Paul Dahlke : Buddhismus als Religion und Moral, München.

G. Grimm : Die Wissenschaft des Buddhismus, Leipzig.

E. Leumann : Buddha and Mahavira, Munich.

W. M. McGovern: A. Manual of Buddhist Philosophy, London, 1923.
Bunyio Nanjio: The Lankāvatāra Sūtra, Kyoto, 1923.
A. Karpelès: Les Questions de Milinda, Paris, 1923.
Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids: Dialogues of the Buddha, London, 1921.
Prince Vijiriyaya, issued by: Buddhaghoṣa's Commentaries on Four Nikāyas of Suttantapitaka (1) Sumangalavilāsinī Digghanikāyātthakathā (2) Papanchasūdanī Majjhimanikāyatthakathā (3) Sāratthapakāsinī Samyuttanikāyatthakathā (4) Manorathapūrani Anguttaranikāyatthakathā, 1921.
C. Bendall and W. H. D. Rouse: Santideva. Sikshāsamuccaya, London, 1922.
August Karl Reischauer: Studies in Japanese Buddhism, New York, 1917.
L. Hodons: Buddhism and Buddhists in China, New York, 1924.
Th. Stcherbatsky: The Soul Theory of the Buddhists, Petrograd, 1920.
G. Cognola: Dialoghi del Re Milinda, Milano, 1923.
F. Max Müller: Dhammapada, Oxford, 1924.
B. C. Law: Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective, Calcutta, 1925.
T. W. Rhys Davids: Buddhist Birth Stories, London, 1922.
S. Levi: Saddharma Puṇḍarīka, Paris, 1925.
Max Walleser: Die buddhistische Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Heidelberg, 1925.
M. Winternitz: Die Vrātyas, Neubiberg, 1925.
F. L. Woodward: Some Sayings of Buddha, London, 1925.
A. D. Jayasundere: The Book of Numerical Sayings, Madras, 1925.
Lord Chalmers: Further Dialogues of the Buddha, London, 1926.
Giuseppe De Lorenzo: India e Buddhismo Antico, Bari, 1926.
Nalinaksha Datta: Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools, London, 1925.
M. Walleser: Ga las hjigs med. Die tibetische Version von Nagarjuna's Kommentar Akutobhaya zur Mādhyamika Kārikā.
P. Shaeffer: Yukti-sastikā, die 60 Sätze der Negativismus.

M. Walleser : Sprache u. Heimat d. Pali-Kanons.
S. J. Aung and M. Walleser : Dogmatic d. modernen südlichen Buddhismus'
D. Rosenberg : Die Weltanschauung d. modernen Buddhismus in fernen Osten.
Jiryo Masuda : Der individualistische Idealismus der Yogāchāra Schule, Heidelberg, 1923-6.
S. Tachibana : The Ethics of Buddhism, London, 1926.
C. Formichi : Il pensiero religioso nell' India prima del Buddha, Bologna, 1925.
S. Levi : Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, Paris, 1925.
A. Hillebrandt : Buddhas Leben and Lehre, Berlin, 1925.
Johannes Rahder : Dasabhūmikasūtra, Louvain, 1926.
la Vallee Poussin : La Morale Bouddhique, Paris, 1927.
E. J. Thomas : The Life of Buddha in Legend and History London, 1927.
M. Walleser : Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus, Heidelberg, 1927.
G. Tucci : Il Buddhismo, Foligno, 1926.
Th. Stcherbatsky : The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, Leningrad, 1927.
La Theorie la Connaissance et la Logique chez les Buddhistes Tardiss, Paris, 1926.
H. N. Randle : Fragments from Diṅnāga, London, 1926.
P. Dahlke : Buddhism and its Place in the Mental Life of Mankind, London, 1927.
B. B. Bidyabinod : Fragment of a Prajñaptimātratā Manuscript from Central India, Calcutta, 1927.
R. Kimura : A Historical Study of the Terms Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, and the Origin of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, Calcutta, 1927.
P. C. Bagchi : Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine, Paris, 1927.
B. C. Law : Women in Buddhist Literature, Colombo, 1927 .
F. Weller : Tausend Buddha Namen des Bhadrakalpa, Leipzig, 1928.
Mrs. Rhys Davids : Gotama the Man, London, 1928.
V. Treucner : The Milindapanho, London, 1928.
J. B. Pratt : The Pilgrimage of Buddhism and a Buddhist Pilgrimage, London, 1928.
G. P. Mallalasekhara : The Pali Literature of Ceylone, London, 1928.
J. Rahder : Glossary of the Dasabhūmikā Sūtra, Paris, 1928.
J. Przyluski : Le concile de Rājagṛha, Paris, 1928.

Hôbôgirin dictionaire encyclopedique du buddhisme. Redacteur en chef P. Demieville, Tokyo, 1929.

M. Winternitz : Der ältere Buddhismus, Tübingen, 1926-9.

S. Konow : Saka Versions of Bhadrakalpikāsūtra, Oslo, 1929.

D. Goddard : Buddhas Golden Path, London, 1930.

B. C. Law : A Study of the Mahāvastu, Calcutta, 1930.

W. M. McGovern : Introduction to Mahayana Buddhism, London, 1932.

V. Gokhale : Aksharasatakam.

G. Tucci : The Nyāyamukha of Diṅnāga.

C. A. F. R. Davids : The Man and His word, Heidelberg, 1930.

W. E. Soothill : The Lotus of the Wonderful Law, Oxford, 1930.

E. Wolff : Zur Lehre vom Bewusstsein (Vijñānavāda) bei den späteren Buddhisten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Lankāvatārasūtra, Heidelberg, 1930.

E. Obermiller : History of Buddhism, Heidelberg, 1931.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : Kindred Sayings on Buddhism, Calcutta, 1930.

D. T. Suzuki : Studies in the Lankāvatārasūtra, London, 1930.

la Vallee Poussin : Le Dogme e la philosophie du bouddhisme, Paris, 1930.

M. Winternitz : Der Mahayana Buddhismus.

la Vallee Poussin : Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, Paris, 1928.

S. Behrsing : Das Dīrghāgamasūtra, Leipzig, 1931.

C. H. Hamilton : Buddhism in India, Ceylone, China and Japan, Chicago, 1931.

Marie Galland : La Vie du Buddha, Paris, 1931.

Bunjiu Nanjio : Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtra, Kyoto, 1931.

Har Dayal : The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanscrit Literature, London, 1932.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon, London, 1931.

Tukumyo Matsumato : Die Prajñaptipāramitā Literatur nebst einem Specimen der Suvikrāntavikrāmi Prajñaptipāramitā, Stuttgart, 1932.

Ryukan Kimura : The Original and Developed Doctrines of Indian Buddhism, Calcutta, 1939.

Suttapitaka. Die Reden des Buddha aus dem "Anguttaranikāya". Einer bis elfer Buch···· übersetzt von Nyayatiloka. München-Neubiberg, 1923.

Dwigt Goddard : A Buddhist Bible, Thetford Vermount, 1932.

D. T. Suzuki : Lankāvatārasūtra, London, 1932.

Vidhusekhar Bhattacharya: Mahāyānaviṁśaka of Nagarjuna.
Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya: Nairātmyaparipṛchchha, Santiniketan, 1931.
S. Schayer: Feuer and Brennstoff, ein Kapitel aus dem Mādhyamikaśāstra des Nāgārjuna mit der Vṛtti des Candrakirti, Lwow, 1926.
B. C. Law: Geography of Early Buddhism, London, 1932.
Mariette Leon: In the Footsteps of the Buddha, London, 1932.
C. A. Kanuma: A Dictionary of Proper Names in Indian Buddhism, Nayoga, 1931.
Benoytosh Bhattacharya: An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism, Oxford, 1932.
H. Jacobi: Triṁśikā Vijñapti des Vasubandhu, Stuttgart, 1932.
S. Levi: Mahākarmavibhaṅga, Paris, 1932.
Baron von Stael-Holstein: Kāśyapaparivarta; a Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class, Shanghai, 1926.
: A Commentary to the Kāśyapaparivarta, Pekin, 1933.
F. Weller: Index to the Kāśyapaparivarta, Cambridge, Mass, 1933.
S. Levi: Mahākarmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhangopadesa, Paris, 1932.
: Materiaux pour l'etude du systeme vijñaptimātra, Paris, 1932.
Lord Chalmers: Buddha's Teaching, London, 1932.
Mrs. Rhys Davids: Outlines of Buddhism, London, 1934.
W. Liebenthal: Satkārya in der Darstellung seiner buddhistichen Gegner, Stuttgart, 1934.
V. Bhattacharya: The Basic Conception of Buddhism, Calcutta, 1934.
E. Leumann: Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus, Leipzig, 1933.
V. Gokhale: Pratītyasamutpādaśāstra des Ullangha, Bonn, 1930.
J. Ph. Vogel: Op het Voetspoor van Boeddha, Haarlem, 1934.
J. Kitayama: Metaphysik des Buddhismus, Stuttgart, 1934.
M. Lahow: Bibliographie Bouddhique, Paris, 1934.
L. Suali: Gotama Buddha, Bologna, 1934.
Mrs. Rhys Davids: Buddhism, its Birth and Dispersal, London, 1934.
K. P. Jayaswal: Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, Lahore, 1934.
G. C. Lownsbery: La Meditation Bouddhique, Paris, 1935.
E. J. Thomas: Early Buddhist Scriptures, London, 1935.

A. C. Woolner : Diṅnāga's Kundamālā, London, 1935.
Trān-Vān-Giap : La Buddhisme, en Annam, Hanoi, 1932.
E. J. Thomas : History of Buddhist Thought, London, 1932.
F. L. Woodward : The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon, London, 1935.
A. C. March : A Buddhist Bibliography, London, 1935.
H. Ui, M. Suzuki, Y. Kanakura and T. Toda : Kanjur and Tanjur. A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons, Sendai, 1934.
„ : A Catalogue Index of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons, Sendai, 1934.
R. Grousset : In the Footsteps of the Buddha, London, 1932.
S. Mookerji : The Buddhist Philosophy of Universal Flux, Calcutta, 1935.
Rahula Sankṛtyayana : Vinaya-Pitaka, Benares, 1935.
H. Kopp : Manorathapūraṇa, London, 1936.
I. Babbitt : The Dhammapada, New York and London, 1936.
G. C. Lownsbery : Buddhist Meditation in the Southern School, London, 1935.
R. Tajima : Etude sur la Mahāvairocana-Sūtra, Paris, 1936.
I. B. Horner : The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected, A Study of the Arhats, London, 1936.
A. H. Longhurst : The Story of the Stupa, Colombo, 1936.
B. C. Law : The Buddhist Conception of Spirits, London, 1937.
: The Concepts of Buddhism, Amsterdam, 1937.
Johannes Nobel : Suvarṇaprabhāsa. Suvarṇaprabhāsottarasūtra, Leipzig, 1937.
P. V. Bapat : Vimuttimagga and Viśuddhimagga, Poona, 1937.
Mrs. Rhys Davids : What Was the Original Gospel in Buddhism ? London, 1938.
N. Ray : Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma, Calcutta, 1936.
E. Lamotte : Le Traité de l'Acte de Vasubandhu : Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, Bruges, 1936.
R. Regamey : Three Chapters from the Samādhirājasūtra, Warszawa, 1938.
C. H. Hamilton : Vasubandhu. Wei shiher Bhih lum, or The Treatise on Twenty Stanzas on Representation only, New Haven, 1938.
I. B. Horner : Vinayapitaka, London, 1938.
A. Kunst : Problem der buddhistischen Logik in der Darstellung des Tattvasangraha, Krakow, 1939.

E. Lamotte : Asanga, La somme du Grand Vehicule. (Mahāyānasangraha), Louvain, 1939.

N. Aiyaswami Sastri : Nāgārjuna's Bhāvasaṅkrāntisūtra and Bhāvasaṅkrāntiśāstra, Adyar, 1938.

F. L. Woodward : Some Sayings of the Buddha according to the Pali Canon, London, 1939.

B. C. Law : The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon, London, 1938.

Helmuth Hoffmann : Bruchstücke des Ātānātikasūtra aus den zentralasiatischen Sanskrit Kanon der Buddhisten, Leipzig, 1939.

Sir H. S. Gaur : The Spirit of Buddhism, London. 1929.

A. D. Jayasundere : The Book of Numerical Sayings, Adyar, 1925.

D. A. Mackenzie : Buddhism in Pre-Christian Britain, London, 1928.

Sir Charles Elliot : Hinduism and Buddhism, London, 1921.

IV

The published literature on Jainism is not so extensive as on Buddhism. The most important series is the Sacred Books of the Jainas. Outside India interest in Jainism is not so keen as in Buddhism. Besides the publications in the above series the following books may be interesting :—

B. Faddegon : The Pravachanasāra, Cambridge, 1931.

J. Hertel : On the Literature of the Svetambaras of Guzerat, Leipzig, 1922.

M. S. Ramaswami Ayyangar and B. Seshgiri Rao : Studies in South Indian Jainism, Madras, 1922.

Maurice Bloomfield : The Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha, Baltimore, 1919.

Siddhasena : Sammatitarkaprakaraṇam, Ahmedabad, 1922.

H. v. Glasenapp : Der Jainismus, Berlin, 1925,

Hemachandra : Pramāṇamīmāṁsā, Poona, 1926.

Mallisena : Anyayogavyavachchhedikā with Syādvādamañjarī, Poona, 1926.

A. Guerinot : La Religion Djaina, Paris, 1927.

P. S. Bose : Haribhadra's Sarvasiddhāntasangraha, Calcutta, 1929.

Walther Schubring : Worte Mahaviras, Leipzig, 1927.

Chimanlal J. Shah : Jainism in North India, Bombay, 1932.

Amulyacharan Sen : Schools and Sects in Jaina Literature, Santiniketan, 1931.

W. Schubring: Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt, Leipzig, 1935.

Shantilal Shah ; The Traditional Chronology of the Jainas, Stuttgart. 1935.

A.N. Upadhye : Kundakundacharya's Pravacanasāra, Bombay, 1935.

B. C. Law : Mahavira, his Life and his Teachings, London, 1937.

A. N. Upadhye : Yogindradeva's Paramārthaprakāśa, Bombay, 1937.

V

The following are some of the works on Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Uttaramīmāṁsā :—

A. B. Keith : Karmamīmāṁsā, London, 1921.

P. C. Chakravarti : Theory of Sphoṭa, Calcutta, 1926.

P. B. Sathe : The Discourses on the Pūrvamīmāṁsā System, Poona, 1927.

F. Edgerton : Mīmāṁsā-Nyāya-Prakāśa, London, 1929.

S. K. Ramanatha Sastri : The Sphotasiddhi of Acharya Mandanamisra, Madras, 1931.

H. von Glasenapp : Madhva's Philosophie des Vishnu-Glaubens, Bonn, 1923.

A. Guha : Jivatman in the Brahmasutras, Calcutta.

V. S. Ghate : La Vedanta, Paris, 1918.

J. H. Woods and C. B. Runkle : Outlines of the Vedanta System of Philosophy, London, 1919.

S. K. Belvalkar : The Brahmasutras of Badarayana, Poona. 1923.

Kokileswar Sastri : An Introduction to Advaita Philosophy, Calcutta, 1924.

M. Sircar : Comparative Studies in Vedantism, Bombay, 1927.

W. S. Urquhart : The Vedanta and Modern Thought, Oxford, 1928.

P. M. Modi : Siddhāntabindu, Bhavnagar, 1929.

S. K. Das : Towards a Systematic Study of the Vedanta, Calcutta, 1931.

J. Charpentier : Brahman, Uppsala, 1932.

D. Srinivasachar : Tarkatāndavam of Sri Vyasatīrtha, Madras, 1932.

Kunhan Raja and S. S. S. Sastri : Mānameyodaya, Adyar, 1933.
" " : Bhāmati (Chatussūtrī), Adyar, 1933.
B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma : The Chatussūtribhāshya of Sri Madhvacharya, Madras, 1934.
S. S. S. Sastri : The Siddhantalesasangraha, Madras, 1935-36.
T. M. P. Mahadevan : The Philosophy of the Advaita with Special Reference to Bharatitirtha-Vidyaranya, Madras, 1939.
Sadhu Santinatha : Māyāvāda, Poona, 1938.
H. N. Raghavendrachar : The Dvaita Philosophy and its Place in the Vedanta, Mysore, 1941.
P. N. Shrinivasachari : The Philosophy of Bhedābheda, Madras, 1935.
Dr. D. M. Datta : Six ways of Knowing, London.
Hayavandana Rao : Srīkarabhāshya, Bangalore.
Dr. Nagaraja Sarma : The Reign of Realism in Indian Philosophy, Madras.

VI

A. C. Vidyabhushana's Work, *History of Indian Logic*, has not yet been superseded. These are some of the other works on Nyaya and Vaiseshika :—

Sir G. Jha : The Nyāyasūtras of Gotama, Allahabad, 1917-9.
Otto Strauss: Des Visvanātha Panchānana Bhattāchārya Kārikāvali, Leipzig, 1922.
A. B. Keith : Indian Logic and Atomism, Oxford, 1921.
B. Faddegon : The Vaiseshika System, Amsterdam, 1918.
H. Ui : The Vaiseshika Philosophy according to Dasapadārtha-Śāstra, London, 1917.
S. Sen : A Study on Mathurānātha's Tattvachintāmaṇirahasya, Wageningen, 1924.
M. Spitzer : Begriffsuntersuchungen Nyāyabhāshya, Leipzig, 1927.
W. Ruben : Die Nyāyasūtra, Leipzig, 1928.
Stafan Stasiak : Fallacies and their Classification according to the Early Hindu Logic, Lwow, 1929.
H. N. Randle : Indian Logic in the Early Schools, London, 1930.
S. Kuppuswami Sastri : A Primer of Indian Logic, Madras, 1932.

Umesa Misra: Conception of Matter according to Nyāya-Vaiseshika, Allahabad, 1936.
S. C. Chatterji: The Nyaya Theory of Knowledge, Calcutta, 1939.

VII

The works on Sāṅkhya and Yoga are :—

S. N. Dasgupta: The Study of Patanjali, Calcutta, 1920.
A. B. Keith: The Sankhya System, London, 1918.
J. Ghosh: Sankhya and Modern Thought, Calcutta, 1930.
S. N. Dasgupta: A Study of the Yoga Philosophy, Calcutta. 1930,
S. S. S. Sastri: The Sāṅkhya Kārikā, Madras, 1930.
Sigurd Lindquist: Die Methoden des Yoga, Lund, 1932.
Srinivasa Iyengar: Haṭhayoga-Pradīpikā, Adyar, 1933.
Sir G. N. Jha: Vijñānabhikṣu's Yogācārasangraha, Adyar, 1933.
M. Takakusu: The Sāṅkhya Kārikā studied in the Light of the Chinese Version, Madras, 1933.
J. Ghosh: A Study of the Yoga, Calcutta, 1934.
E. H. Johnston: Early Sankhya, London, 1937.
K. T. Behanan: Yoga: a scientific evaluation, London, 1937.
Sulakhan Sing: The Theory and Practice of Yoga, Prague, 1937.
G. Coster: Yoga and Western Psychology.
C. Bragdon: An Introduction to Yoga, London, 1933.

VIII

The literature on the Vedas is vast. As a separate chapter is devoted to it most of it is omitted here. But the following works may be interesting to the student of pure philosophy.

A. Hillebrandt: Aus Brāhmaṇas und Upanishaden, Jena, 1933.
H. D. Grisword: The Religion of the Rigveda, Oxford, 1924.
S. F. Michalski-Iwienski: Upanizady, Krakow, 1924.
J. Hertel: Die Weisheit Upanishaden, München, 1921.
A. B. Keith: The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the Upanishads, Cambridge, Mass, 1935.
R. D. Ranade: A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy, Poona, 1926.
A. Hillebrandt: Vedische Mythologie, Braslau, 1937.
B. Datta: A History of Vedic Literature, Lahore, 1927.
K. F. Geldner: Vedismus u. Brahmanismus, Tübingen, 1926–9.
P. S, Deshmukh: The Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature, London, 1933.

S. C. Chakravarti : The Philosophy of the Upanishads, Calcutta, 1935.

M. N. Sircar : Mysticism according to the Upanishads, London.

IX

These are some of the interesting works on the Bhagavadgita :—

Franklin Edgerton : The Bhagavadgita, Chicago. 1925.

Rudolf Otto : Der Sang des Hehr-erhabenen, Stuttgart, 1938,
: Die Urgestalt Bhagavadgita, Tübingen, 1934.
: Die Lehrtraktate der Bhagavadgita, Tübingen, 1935.

B. S. Sukthankar and B. G. Tilak : Srimad Bhagavadgita-rahasya or Karmayoga Sastra, Poona.

Aurobindo Ghose : Essays on the Bhagavadgita, Calcutta, 1928.

X

Works on Saivism are not many. They are :—

K. R. Subrahmanian : The Origin of Saivism and its History in the Tamil Land, Madras, 1929.

F. Kingsbury : Hymns of the Tamil Saivaite Saints, Calcutta, 1921.

S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri : The Sivadvaita of Srikantha, Madras, 1930.
: Appayya Dikshita's Sivadvaita-
: nirnaya, Madras, 1929.

C. V. Narayana Ayyar : The Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India, Madras, 1936.

V. Paranjyoti : Saivasiddhanta in the Meykanda Sastra. London, 1938.

Sigurd Lindquist : Siddhi and Abhinna, Uppsala, 1932.

S. Sivapadasundaram : The Saiva School of Hinduism, London, 1934.

K. C. Pande : Abhinavagupta, Benares.

XI

The names of Sir John Woodroffe and Arthus Avalon still stand out in the front rank of the workers on Saktism. Some of the works on Saktism are :—

E. A. Payne : The Sâktas, Calcutta, 1933.

V. G. Rele : The Mysterious Kundalini, Bombay, 1929.

Arthus Avalon : The Serpent Power, Madras, 1934.
: Tantrik Texts, Kāmakalāvilāsa, Calcutta, 1922.
: The Great Liberation, Madras, 1927.

Sir J. Woodroffe : The Garland of Letters, Madras, 1922.
: Shakti and Shākta, Madras, 1929.

XII

On Vaishnavism there are a few more important books. Some of them are :—

B. K. Sastri : Bhakti Cult in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1922.

H. C. Raychaudhari : Materials for a Study of the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect, Calcutta, 1920.

D. C. Sen : The Vaishnava Literature of Medieval Bengal, Calcutta 1917.
: Chaitanya and his Companions, Calcutta, 1917.

J. N. Sircar : Chaitanya's Life and Teachings, Calcutta, 1922.

M. T. Kennedy : The Chaitanya Movement, London, 1925.

G. N. Mallik : The Philosophy of Vaishnava Religion, Lahore, 1927.

M. M. Bose : The Post-Chaitanya Sahajiya Cult of Bengal, Calcutta, 1930.

B. Kumarappa : The Hindu Conception of Deity as Culminating in Ramanuja, London, 1934.

N. A. Toothi : The Vaishnavas of Gujarat, Calcutta, 1935.

G. W. Briggs : Goraknath and the Kanpatha Yogis, Calcutta, 1938.

O. Lacombe : La Doctrine Morale et metaphysique de Ramanuja, Paris, 1938.

XIII

Works on Indian philosophy written by the ancients were not divided into subjects like ethics, psychology, metaphysics etc. The subjects were mixed up and it is only of late, after the advent of European thought, that attempts are being made to separate these subjects. In Sir S. Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy* such topics are minutely divided. Works dealing systematically with Indian ethics, Indian psychology, and so forth are few. But a few works have

appeared which will be of help for further work. Books of a general nature covering the whole of Indian philosophy are fairly many. Some of these are misleading, having taken a particular view-point as the best and as the standard. Others are unreliable due to biases often of a religious nature. However, for impartial work in the future many of these books are useful and they are scholarly. Works of a general nature are :—

B. M. Barua : A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, Calcutta, 1921.

H. v. Glasenapp : Der Hinduismus : Religion und Gesellschaft im heutigen Indien, München, 1921.

Sir Francis Younghusband : The Gleam (Studies in Eastern Religion), London, 1923.

Paul Masson-Oursel : Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Philosophie Indienne, Paris, 1923.

J. E. Carpenter : Theism in Medieval India, London, 1921.

A. C. Das : Ṛgvedic India, Calcutta, 1921.

E. Arbmann : Rudra, Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus, Uppsala, 1922.

J. B. Pratt : India and its Faiths, London, 1916.

Dorothea Jane Stephen : Studies in Early Indian Thought, Cambridge, 1918.

Maharaja Sir V. S. Rangarao Bahadur : Hindu Religion Madras, 1918.

J. N. Farquhar : An Outline of the Religious Literature of India, Oxford, 1920.

Champatrai Jain : The Key of Knowledge, Arrah, 1919.

R. E. Hume : The World's Living Religions, New York, 1924.

Radhakumud Mookerji : Men and Thought in Ancient India, London, 1924.

Otto Strauss : Indische Philosophie, München, 1925.

R. O. Windstedt : Shaman, Saiva and Sufi, London, 1925.

J. M. Macfie : Myths and Legends of India : an introduction to the study of Hinduism, Edinburg, 1924.

A. C. Das : Ṛgvedic Culture, Calcutta, 1925.

T. Isaac Tambyah : Foregleams of God, a Comparative Study of Hinduism, Buddhism and Christianity.

W. Crooke : Religion and Folklore of Northern India, Oxford, 1926.

P. Yentic: Karma and Reincarnation in Hindu Religious Philosophy, London, 1927.
A. Butterworth: The Substance of Indian Faith, Camberly, 1926.
E. Abegg: Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran, Berlin, 1928.
C. A. Kinkaid: Teachers of India, London, 1927.
H. von Glasenapp: Religiöse Reformbewegungen im heutigen Indien, Leipzig, 1928.
E. Thomson: Suttee, London, 1928.
H. N. Brown: The Indian and Christian Miracles of Waking on the Water, Chicago, 1928.
J. Prasad: Introduction to Indian Philosophy, Allahabad, 1928.
B. Heimann: Studien zur Eigenart indischen Denkens, Tübingen, 1930.
Dakshina Ranjan Sastri: A Short History of Indian Materialism.
F. O. Schrader: Der Hinduismus.
René Grousset: Les Philosophie Indiennes, Paris, 1931.
: The Civilizations of the East, India, London, 1932.
J. Abbot: The Keys of Power, A Study of Indian Ritual and Belief, London, 1932.
Max Hunter Harrison: Hindu Monism and Pluralism, London, 1932.
R. D. Ranade: Mysticism in Maharashtra, Poona, 1933.
N. K. Brahma: The Philosophy of Hindu Sadhana, Calcutta, 1932.
Nihar Ranjan Ray: Brahmanical Gods in Burma, Calcutta, 1932.
Maximilian Kern: Das Licht des Ostens, Berlin, 1922.
W. M. Teape: The Secret Lore of India and the One Perfect Life for All, Cambridge, 1934.
S. N. Dasgupta: Indian Idealism, Cambridge, 1933.
N. Macnicol: The Living Religions of Indian People, London, 1934.
L. S. S. O'Malley: India's Social Heritage, Oxford, 1934.
K. Saunders: Ideals of East and West, Cambridge, 1934.
R. G. Sahani: The Coming of Karuna, London, 1934.
P. M. Modi: Akshara: A Forgotten Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy, Baroda, 1932.
L. S. S. O'Malley: Popular Hinduism, Cambridge, 1937.
W. T. Garrat: The Legacy of India, Oxford, 1937.
B. L. Atreya: The Philosophy of Yogavasishtha, Madras, 1936.

Mohan Sing : Goraknath and Medieval Hindu Mysticism, Lahore, 1937.

P. Masson-Oursel : La Philosophie en Orient, Paris, 1938.

J. Sinha : Indian Realism, London, 1938.

Sadhu Santinath : A Critical Examination of the Philosophy of Religion, Poona, 1938.

S. Schayer : Contribution to the Problem of Time in Indian Philosophy, Krakow, 1938.

H. D. Bhattacharya : The Foundations of Living Faiths, Calcutta, 1938.

S. Levi : L'Indie Civilisatrice, Paris, 1938.

B. K. Sarkar : Introduction to Indian Positivism, Allahabad, 1937.

H. N. Spalding : Civilizations in East and West, London, 1939.

D. R. Bhandarkar : Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture, Madras, 1940.

K. N. Dikshit : Prehistoric Civilizations of the Indus Valley, Madras, 1935.

H. von Glasenapp : Unsterblichkeit und Erlösung in den Indischen Religionen, Halle, 1938.

L. Adams Beck : The Story of Oriental Philosophy, New York, 1938.

M. C. Pandya : Intelligent Man's Guide to Indian Philosophy, Bombay, 1935.

Albert Schweitzer: Indian Thought and its Development, London, 1936.

D. V. Athalye : Neo-Hinduism, Bombay, 1932.

Mrs. Rhys Davids : Indian Religions and Survival, London, 1934.

H. D. W. Griswold : Insights into Modern Hinduism, New York, 1934.

A. Barth : The Religions of India, London, 1921.

S. Radhakrishnan : Indian Philosophy, London.

S. N. Dasgupta : History of Indian Philosophy, Cambridge.

XIV

On Aesthetics the following are interesting :—

A. Foucher : The Beginnings of Buddhist Art and Other Essays, London, 1917.

L'Art Greco-Bouddhique du Gandhara, Paris, 1918.

K. S. Ramaswami Sastri : Indian Aesthetics, Madras.

A. Sankaran : Some Aspects of Literary Criticism, Madras.

S. K. De: Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics, Calcutta, 1925.

A. Coomaraswamy: The Dance of Siva, New York, 1918.

E. B. Havell: The Ideals of Indian Art, London, 1919.

H. Schäfer and U. Andrae: Die Kunst des alten Orients, Berlin, 1925.

Stella Kramrisch: Grundzüge der indischen Kunst, Dresden, 1924.

A. Coomaraswamy: Bibliographies of Indian Art, Boston, 1925.

Dr. Ernst Diez: Die Kunst Indiens, Wildpark–Potsdam, 1926.

Subodh-candra Mukhopadhyaya: Le Rasa, Essai sur l'astheti-tique indienne, Paris, 1918.

L. Binyon: The Spirit of Man in Asian Art, Cambridge, Mass, 1935.

Mulkraj A. Anand: Hindu View of Art, London.

XV

On Ethics and Sociology the following may be useful :—

G. H. Mees: Dharma and Society, London, 1935.

J. W. Hauer: Eine indo–arische Metaphysik des Kampf und der Tat. Die Bhagavadgita in neuer Sicht, 1934.

P. Sivaswami Iyer: The Evolution of Hindu Moral Ideals, Calcutta, 1935.

J. Makenzie: Hindu Ethics, Oxford, 1922.

A. H. Benton: Indian Moral Instruction and Caste Problems, London, 1917.

Emile Senart: La Castes dans la Inde, Paris, 1927.

S. V. Karandikar: Hindu Exogamy, Bombay, 1929.

P. V. Kane: History of Dharmaśastra, Poona, Vol. I, 1930, Vol. II, 1941.

N. K. Dutt: The Origin and Growth of Caste in India, London, 1931

Santosh Kumar Das: The Educational System of the Ancient Hindus, Calcutta, 1930.

E. A. M. Blunt: The Caste Systems of Northern India, London, 1931.

L. S. S. O'Malley: Indian Caste Customs, Cambridge, 1932.

A. S. Altekar: Education in Ancient India, Benares, 1934.

S. Das: Self-Expression and the Indian Social Problems, Lahore, 1937.

S. Radhakrishnan and Huges: The Individual in East and West, Oxford, 1939.

G. S. Ghurye: Caste and Race in India, London, 1932.

Stanley Rice: Hindu Customs, London, 1937.

S. Tachibana: The Ethics of Buddhism, London, 1926.
Professor Hamkins: The Ethics of India, Chicago.

XVI

On Indian Psychology there are very few works. They are :—
J. N. Sinha: Indian Psychology-Perception, London, 1934.
M. Falk: Il mito psicologico nell' India antica, Roma, 1939.
Mrs. Rhys Davids: Buddhist Psychology, London, 1924.
G. Coster: Yoga and Western Psychology.

XVII

Really the most useful and difficult work done on Indian philosophy is the comparative study. Because of its difficult nature very few books have been published on the subject. The comparisons incidentally made in several works are often superficial. And the tendency to see Holism, Emergent Evolution etc., in Indian philosophy is deplorable. Works in which systematic comparisons have been attempted are very few. But only when such books are written, are future constructions, which will be developments also of ancient thought, possible, and philosophical traditions can be established. Some works of the kind are :—

P. Masson-Oursel: Comparative Philosophy, London.

B. Heimann: Indian and Western Philosophy, London, 1937.

P. T. Raju: Thought and Reality, Hegelianism and Advaita, London, 1937.

S. Radhakrishnan: Eastern Religions and Western Thought, Oxford, 1939.
East and West in Religion, London.

S. Cave: Redemption, Hindu and Christian, London, 1919.

A. A. Macdonell: Lectures on Comparative Religion, Calcutta, 1925.

XVIII

Works of a constructive nature are not many. They belong only to contemporary thinkers, by some of whom old material is recast in new forms. Works which give us fresh view-points cutting through ancient speculations are practically nil. The following works would be of interest so far as contemporary thought is concerned :—

J. H. Muirhead and S. Radhakrishna: Contemporary Indian Philosophy, London.

S. Radhakrishnan : Idealist View of Life, London.
: Kalki or the Future of Civilization, London.
: The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy, London.

Bhagavan Das : The Science of Peace, Adyar.
: Socialism, Ancient and Modern, Adyar.

Sri Aurobindo Ghose : The Riddle of Life, Calcutta.

Rabindranath Tagore : Sadhana, London.
: The Religion of Man, London.
: Man, Waltair.

K. C. Bhattacharya : The Subject as Freedom, Amalner.

G. R. Malkani : The Self, Amalner.

Hiralal Haldar : Neo-Hegelianism, London.

J. Krishnamurti has a peculiar system of thought, which is his own, but to which he has not yet given a systematic expression. His ideas may be called anti-traditionalism. They have to be gathered from his lectures. In Mahatma Gandhi's writings too we find systematic thought working, which is very akin to the Advaita. His ideas too have to be gathered from his several writings. Sir M. Iqbal too has developed a philosophy of his own which is fairly systematically given in his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam.* His ideas are largely influenced by the Sufis of Persia, Bergson and Nietzsche.

XIX

In surveying the general trend of the thought of contemporary Indian philosophers, we may say that most of them deplore the negative attitude to the world. Of them Sri Aurobindo Ghose among the Hindus and Iqbal among the Muslims are the foremost. In recasting and reinterpreting ancient thought, the Advaita has been more made use of than the other systems. One interesting feature is the several approaches made to the Advaita by the contemporary thinkers. The difference between matter and spirit is more and more treated as nothing and the transformation of matter into spirit is more insisted upon than escape from it. What is now wanted of the philosopher in India is a systematic development of these trends and not merely the translation and exposition of our ancient thought. Otherwise, the Indian philosopher would be an antiquarian and cannot keep himself in touch with contemporary life.

STUDY OF MANUSCRIPTS

By

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

Elsewhere[1] I have given a general account of the history and progress of the study of Sanskrit manuscripts during the last three quarters of a century. It will be seen that systematic work in this connection started in the seventies of the last century at the initiative taken by the Government. The work of collection and description of important manuscripts found scattered in different parts of the country slowly but regularly proceeded since then in some of the provinces like Bengal, Bombay,[2] Madras and U..P. And huge collections of manuscripts grew up in these places in course of time. But in the earlier stages stress was naturally laid more on exploration and acquisition than on critical study and classification. Admirable beginnings in this direction were made as early as the year 1853 when Weber's *Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek* was published. But regular and sustained work started long after and enormous work has been done during the last twenty-five years. In fact, the period under review is characterised by systematic activities in the line of proper arrangement and analysis of the materials already collected. This of course resulted in a partial discouragement of the work of exploration. The Royal

---

1. *Festschrift Prof. P. V. Kane*, pp. 73–81.

2. It was during the period under review that large collections of Government manuscripts were transferred to non-official bodies. Thus the Bombay Government collections, made during half a century and deposited in the Deccan College, were made over to the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in September 1918. The little-known collection of the Archaeological Survey of India, deposited in the Indian Museum of Calcutta, was permanently lent to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in December 1936. Unlike the Bombay collections which were arranged, listed and partially studied, this has not as yet been properly scrutinised. A rapid preliminary survey was made by the present writer. A few of the more important and interesting manuscripts belonging to the collection were exhibited and commented on in the meetings of the Society or otherwise dealt with in some details (YRASB, 1938, *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, *XIV*. 275–9, *Festschrift F. W. Thomas*, pp. 43–5). It is a collection of nearly 12000 Mss. consisting mainly of ritualistic works and popular handbooks on various subjects in different branches of Sanskrit literature.

Asiatic Society of Bengal definitely gave up the search for manuscripts in the year 1914 to devote the funds available exclusively to the work of preparation of a descriptive catalogue. In Bombay the systematic work of collection seems to have ceased sometime about the year 1915. As a matter of fact, it was discouraged by Dr. Kielhorn in the eighties of the last century and once again by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar about a decade later. The former scholar 'just before leaving India had reported to Government that no good stock of valuable manuscripts would be available for purchase, as, according to him, all good libraries and places in the circle had been thoroughly exploited by himself and Dr. Bühler and that almost all desirable possessions including Bhurjapatra Mss. had been secured for Government by them both.'[1] The latter scholar was of opinion that regular search might be 'discontinued under certain safeguards.' And we find that within a short time the Government grant was considerably reduced leaving very little margin for the work of search and acquisition.[2] Later experience however shows that innumerable manuscripts are still lying uncared for in aristocratic families and in the houses of traditional pandits whose descendants have scant regard for these objects. Many of these have been collected by non-official bodies with little or no money and many more still remain to be saved from imminent destruction and to be acquired and placed in safe custody. What is required for this purpose is patient, diligent and tactful work backed by some money. The condition of the manuscripts noticed by scholars of the last generation in different individual collections is in most cases far from satisfactory and may be acquired with little difficulty now though they might have baffled all attempts of earlier workers, for the present owners have less regard for these things than their predecessors and also because the awakening of a scientific spirit will induce many to hand them over to scholars and scholarly institutions. It is really painful to find therefore that the work of conservation has occupied our sole attention and energy to the almost utter neglect of the other important work of search and collection.

It was during the period under review that descriptive catalogues of various important and valuable collections of Sanskrit and

1. Belvalkar, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss deposited in the Deccan College*, Vol. I, Introduction, p. XXI.

2. *Ibid*, pp. XXIX, XXX.

vernacular[1] manuscripts have been published. Besides, numerous papers have been written drawing attention to notable features of important manuscripts. A fairly good number of old texts have also been published on the basis of manuscripts already collected or recently discovered.

A notable feature of the period is the growing interest taken by non-official bodies in the collection and study of manuscripts—a work which originally thrived under the auspices of the Government. It is true that much valuable work is still being done in Madras (Oriental Library), Poona (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute), Calcutta (Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal) and Benares (Sanskrit College) directly under the Government or with Government grants of money. But numerous institutions—scholarly as well as popular—have also sprung up in more or less recent times which are now doing laudable work in collecting and preserving manuscripts. Of these collections I may refer to a few. Important acquisitions have been made by the Oriental Institute of Baroda, the Venkateswar Research Institute of Tirupati, the Varendra Research Institute of Rajshahi, the Visvabharati of Bolpur, the Calcutta University, the Vangiya Sahitya Parishat, the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat and the Indian Research Institute of Calcutta and the Rammala Granthagar of Comilla. Of smaller and less known collections made by individuals and popular institutions mention may be made of the Rangpur Sahitya Parishat, Midnapnr Sahitya Parishat, Gauranga-granthagar of Panihati and the collections of Kumar Saratkumar Roy of Dighapatiya.[2]

It is a matter of regret that the contents of most of these collections are quite unknown as very few of them possess even mere lists of names of the manuscripts belonging to them. It must be said to the credit of the Editor of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*

1. I purposely refrain from making any special reference to vernacular manuscripts, as only partial accounts of them are available in English. It is true Descriptive Catalogues of vernacular manuscripts in the Madras Oriental Library, Tanjore Saraswati Mahal Library, the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Calcutta University Library have been published in English, but there are also important publications in the different vernaculars dealing with them.

2. I am sorry it has not been possible for me to refer to similar collections outside Bengal. It may be hoped that this reference to collections of one province would not be taken amiss and scholars of different provinces would come forward with notes on various manuscript collections.

that he has taken pains and spent money for preparing and getting lists of manuscripts from a number of these institutions. But it is a pity that many of them did not even give any reply to the enquiries sent round by him.

The period under review also marks the beginning of attempts for proper scientific conservation of manuscripts in some of the big libraries. A large number of highly important and valuable manuscripts though housed in palatial buildings in India are found to be decaying from year to year through ravages of a tropical climate and especially various insects. Usually little attention is given to this sad and not at all negligible condition of this vast literary treasure of old India. No specific has yet been discovered which could give sufficient protection against the pests of which books and manuscripts in a tropical country are constant victims. Different big libraries occasionally use different precipes with little or no benefit. The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal has of late been taking keen interest in the matter. Besides regularly dusting and cleaning scientific measures have been taken to prevent damage by insects. Steps have been taken to repair, at a comparatively heavy cost, manuscripts that have already been damaged. The technique of repair was determined on the advice of experts in India and abroad. A preparation of paradichlor-benzene is being used as a disinfectant. Time alone will show how effective it will prove. A few institutions like the Madras Oriental Library and the Sanskrit College of Calcutta have provisions for copying by scribes decaying manuscripts. But this is no way an ideal arrangement; faithful reproduction is seldom to be obtained through this process and it cannot preserve the paleographical interest of the manuscripts. Mechanical reproduction through microfilm and photostat cameras are free from these defects. And hence these highly expensive machines which are available in some institutions have recently begun to be used though to a very small extent. The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal is the proud possessor of one Ica Famulus Camera for photostating and another camera for microfilming manuscripts and documents. The cost of reproduction of records through these processes is cheap and negligible in normal times. The cameras in the Society are working since 1940-41, for though the first was received through presentation several years back it was lying unused all along till it was repaired and made ready for use in 1940, while the second was received on loan from the Library of Congress, America, very recently.

It is now proposed to give a bird's-eye-view account of the work done to bring to light the contents of the manuscripts. It is not possible to make here even a passing reference to the numerous papers and books published on and with manuscripts. It is well-known that quite a good number of valuable old texts have been published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Trivendrum Sanskrit Series, Kashmere Series and the Madras University Sanskrit Series, to mention only the more important series. We should however draw special attention to three publications which have special importance from the standpoint of study of manuscripts. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* undertaken by the University of Madras, of which a provisional fascicule was published in 1937 will remove a keenly felt want when completed. Huge collections of manuscripts that have been made and the very large number of catalogues that have come out since the publication of the third and last part of Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* in 1903 made it impossible for scholars to gather full information about a work. The publication of a revised and up-to-date edition of the work was thus long overdue and the Madras University is to be congratulated for taking up this arduous work.

Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism (Bombay, 1941) by Dr. S. M. Katre is a useful work which discusses the principles to be followed in critically using and editing a manuscript. *Praśasti-saṁgraha* (Ahmedabad, 1930) is another interesting and valuable publication which contains *Praśastis* collected from 1500 Jain manuscripts belonging to different institutions. Varied interest attaches to these *Praśastis* which record the names of copyists and the dates of copying, give accounts of persons at whose instance and the purposes for which the work of copying was undertaken, and sometimes refer to the personal history of the author of a particular work. Much useful information regarding the social, cultural and religious life in Medieval India, especially of the Jains, is found scattered in its pages. There are extracts here from manuscripts belonging to as early periods as 9th–12th centuries. It is learnt from these extracts that people with a religious bent of mind would get copies of works—generally religious texts—made by professional copyists and make gifts of them to monasteries and religious teachers with a view to earn spiritual blessings. There is reference to a number of amateur copyists, including several ladies, who took upon themselves the task of copying, with the same end in view.

Of catalogues published during the period reference may be made to those of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Madras Oriental Library, Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Poona and the India Office Library of London.[1] These represent some of the oldest and most important collections in and outside India. It may be noted that all these collections are maintained by Government and very few of the many feudatory states or non-official bodies that have got similar collections have undertaken elaborate descriptive catalogues of the type of those published or undertaken by the above-mentioned Libraries and Societies. It must be admitted that inspite of their detailed contents these catalogues are not all free from glaring defects and have enough scope for improvements.[2]

A complete and up-to-date descriptive catalogue of the huge collection of manuscripts in the Sarasvati Mahal Library of Tanjore has been compiled and published in 19 volumes within an incredibly short span of eight years (1927-1934) under the editorship of Prof. P. P. S. Shastri. Of the various indices to the whole set appended to the last volume, three (e. g. those of owners, scribes and dated manuscripts) are specially interesting.

In 1935 the India Office published the second volume (in two parts) of its valuable series of learned catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts under the editorship of Profs. Keith and Thomas. The first volume of the series, complete in seven parts (London, 1887-1904), was edited by Prof. Eggeling. The comprehensive index appended to the present volume, the absence of which in the first volume was keenly felt, facilitates the use of the whole series.

The period has also seen the completion of the first series of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Madras Oriental Library in 29 volumes, of which volumes 20 onwards were published after 1917 under the editorship of Prof. Kuppuswami Shastri and P. P. S. Shastri. This describes manuscripts acquired upto 1911. Nine volumes of the second Series of Triennial Catalogues which began to be published in 1913 have brought the catalogue down to the col-

1. An almost comprehensive bibliography of all published catalogues has been contributed by Mr. P. K. Gode in the form of Appendix 2 published in Katre's *Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism* (Bombay, 1941).

2. *Festschrift Prof. P. V. Kane*, pp. 78f., 80.

lections of 1937. Three useful index volumes containing the titles and the names of authors have been published recently.

Catalogues of only portions of other old collections (e. g., those of the Bengal, Bombay and U. P. Governments) have been published. Attempts have been made to make these really useful and scholarly. The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, custodian of the Bengal Government manuscripts, has so far published nine volumes of catalogues during the last twenty-five years, while steps have been taken to expedite the publication of the remaining five volumes, particular volumes having been assigned to particular scholars. Each volume of catalogue is accompanied by an elaborate introduction which draws attention to the important features of the manuscripts described in the volume. The late Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. H. P. Shastri, one of the two scholars who built up this collection of 12000 manuscripts had the rough copy of the descriptive slips of the entire collection made under his supervision and saw through the press six complete volumes and part of the seventh volume.

After long years of protracted work one volume of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Bombay collections was published in 1916. But arrangements have now been made for expediting the work by the authorities of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, the present custodians of the manuscripts, who have already published eight volumes in five years (1935-40). But though it will yet be some years before the entire catalogue is published the world of scholars will be able to fully utilise this big library of manuscripts through printed lists which have been made up-to-date in 1925 by the publication of the lists of manuscripts acquired during 1866-68 and 1895-1924. It is a pity that no such complete list is available of the Bengal collections.

Only one volume of Descriptive Catalogue has so far been published of the big collection of manuscripts at the Benares Sanskrit College. One would expect the library, which has for a long time the rare fortune of being looked after by a wholetime qualified scholar-librarian, should get ready its descriptive catalogue in a short time.

Of catalogues of feudatory states and non-official collections reference may be made to two (viz., State Library of Baroda and the Vangiya Sahitya Parishat of Calcutta), both of which make an attempt to compress different items of information fonnd in a Descriptive Catalogue within a short space in a tabular form. Extracts

from select manuscripts are either given in the appendix or in the Introduction. This form is helpful in facilitating reference work and saves mechanical and not infrequently useless reproduction of extracts.

I have already pointed out the disadvantages under which study of manuscripts has to be carried on in our country.[1] It has been shown how lack of sympathy and appreciation is responsible for haphazard and unsatisfactory work. I also urged on the necessity of the creation of a central organisation for guiding and regulating manuscript studies all over the country along systematic and uniform lines. All scholars interested in manuscripts feel that something must be done for doing full justice to the valuable treasures of manuscripts lying here and there. And it is quite in the fitness of things that Dr. C. Kunhan Raja of Madras has suggested that a conference of the authorities of manuscript libraries should be convened for devising ways and means for the purpose.[2] We can also easily have a Manuscript section in our Oriental Conference where we might discuss all questions connected with manuscripts and take stock of the work done during the period intervening two conferences. This may be helpful in compiling the long-needed list of the numerous collections—private and public—spread over different corners of the country.

---

1. *Festschrift Prof. P. V. Kane*, pp. 76 ff.

2. A definite step was taken in this direction at the All-India Oriental Conference held at Hyderabad in December 1941 when the Manuscript Library Association was formed. —Ed